

The ALIANCE

THE WORLD'S LEADING REVIEW

Features of
This Number

POPULAR ELEC- TION OF U. S. SENATORS

By CHAS. H. FOX, Ph.D.

EDUCATION AND DEMOCRACY

By
Rabbi CHAS. FLEISCHER

THE ANGLO-JAP- ANESE TREATY

By
EDWIN MAXEY, LL.D.

BUDDHISM AS I HAVE SEEN IT

By the
Rev. CLARENCE E. RICE

MAY, 1902

THE ANGLO-JAPANESE TREATY EDWIN MAXEY, LL.D.
POPULAR ELECTION OF U. S. SENATORS . CHARLES H. FOX, PH.D.

JAPANESE BUDDHISM:

- I. Its Philosophic and Doctrinal Teachings . KEIJIRO NAKAMURA
- II. Buddhism as I Have Seen It . REV. CLARENCE EDGAR RICE

EDUCATION AND DEMOCRACY: A Conversation

RABBI CHARLES FLEISCHER

THE PLACE OF EDUCATION IN REFORM . DR. ERNEST C. MOORE

Of the University of California

THE ICONOCLAST AS A BUILDER SHALER G. HILLYER

WIVES, WIDOWS, AND WILLS MISS M. E. CARTER

HE FOUND LIFE: A Story LURELLA R. KRAYBILL

TOPICS OF THE TIMES—(Editorial) B. O. FLOWER

Organized Labor and Direct Legislation—Is the Declaration of Independence a Treasonable Document?—The Cultivation of Rice, Tea, and Smyrna Figs in the United States—A New Cure for Tuberculosis—Notable Discoveries in the Field of Illumination—How Russia Met the Advance of an Arrogant Monopoly—A Pathetic Incident and What It Suggests.

BOOKS OF THE DAY Studies and Reviews

The Octopus—The New World and the New Thought—Imperialism and Liberty—The Doom of Dogma and the Dawn of Truth—Good Cheer Nuggets—Beyond the Black Ocean—Dorothy Quincy—Minette.—Books Received.

NOTES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS J. E. M.

Vol. XXVII. No. 5. * * * * * Per Annum, \$2.50

569 FIFTH AVE. / THE ALLIANCE PUBLISHING CO. NEW YORK

LONDON: Gay & Bird, 22 Bedford St., Strand.
MELBOURNE: G. G. Turri & Co., Salisbury Bldg.

Foreign Subscriptions,
Twelve Shillings

L A C K A W A N N A HOPATCONG



IN THE HIGHLANDS OF NEW JERSEY

A delightful resort, 1,200 feet above sea level; reached in 80 minutes from New York by fast express trains over the Lackawanna Railroad; cool, dry and invigorating; every facility for camping, fishing, sailing, automobiling; modern hotels.

Tourists visiting New York during the summer will find Lake Hopatcong a convenient headquarters for their trips to town.

Write for "Lakes and Mountains," a little book telling about Lake Hopatcong and its hotels and boarding houses as well as about other resorts on the Lackawanna Railroad.

Address: T. W. LEE,
General Passenger Agent, New York City

*"We do not take possession of our ideas, but are possessed by them.
They master us and force us into the arena,
Where, like gladiators, we must fight for them."*

—HEINE.

THE ARENA

VOL. XXVII.

MAY, 1902.

No. 5.

THE ANGLO-JAPANESE TREATY.

THE center of political interest is now the "Far East." While this has been true for but a few years, there is ample reason to believe that it will be the great fact in the politics of the twentieth century. The question of the "balance of power" in Europe dominated European politics during the greater part of the nineteenth century, but this is a relatively simple and small-sized problem compared with the question of the "balance of power" in the Orient. A mastery of the former included a calculation of the attitude and strength of the European powers; the latter includes not only this but other factors and forces much more difficult to calculate. There is in the first place that great enigma—China. A calculation of the attitude and strength of China is a vastly more complex and difficult matter than that of any European power. It is one thing to interpret the motives and purposes, to forecast the actions, and to estimate the strength of a people of like civilization, and quite another thing with respect to a people of widely different civilization. China may at any time act in a way unintelligible to European statesmen. The factors in the solution of this problem are further increased by the addition of two powers to whom the "balance of power" in Europe is, politically speaking, a matter of indifference, but whose interests necessitate their being taken into account in considering the question

of the "balance of power" in the Orient. One of these—the United States—is fairly well understood; but the other—Japan—is still more or less of a riddle.

Not only is the problem an intensely difficult one, but it is one of surprising importance. Its solution is fraught with much meaning to a large portion if not to all of mankind; for such is the increasing interdependence of the race that the welfare of a part affects in a greater or less degree the welfare of the whole. That the solution of this problem is one of vital concern to the industrial and commercial interests of the world, and that it will have an important bearing upon the trend of civilization, does not admit of doubt. Such being its difficulty, its importance, and our own interests in it, the latest move toward a solution of it is well worthy of our careful attention. The text of the treaty, which we have secured from a semi-official source, is as follows:

The Governments of Great Britain and Japan, actuated solely by a desire to maintain the *status quo* and general peace in the extreme East, being moreover specially interested in maintaining the independence and territorial integrity of the Empire of China and the Empire of Corea, and in securing equal opportunities in those countries for the commerce and industry of all nations, hereby agree as follows:

ARTICLE 1.—The high contracting parties, having mutually recognized the independence of China and Corea, declare themselves to be entirely uninfluenced by any aggressive tendencies in either country. Having in view, however, their special interests, of which those of Great Britain relate principally to China, while Japan, in addition to the interests she possesses in China, is interested in a peculiar degree politically, as well as commercially and industrially, in Corea, the high contracting parties recognize that it will be admissible for either of them to take such measures as may be indispensable in order to safeguard those interests if threatened either by the aggressive action of any other power or by disturbances arising in China or Corea and necessitating the intervention of either of the high contracting parties for the protection of the lives and property of its subjects.

ART. 2.—If either Great Britain or Japan, in defense of their respective interests as above described, should become involved in war with another power, the other high contracting party will maintain a strict neutrality and use its efforts to prevent other powers from joining in hostilities against its ally.

ART. 3.—If in the above event any other power or powers should join in hostilities against that ally, the other high contracting party

will come to its assistance and will conduct the war in common, and make peace in mutual agreement with it.

ART. 4.—The high contracting parties agree that neither of them will, without consulting the other, enter into any separate arrangements with another power to the prejudice of the interests above described.

ART. 5.—Whenever, in the opinion of Great Britain or Japan, the above-mentioned interests are in jeopardy, the two Governments will communicate with one another fully and frankly.

ART. 6.—The present agreement will come into effect immediately after the date of its signature, and remain in force five years from that date.

In case neither of the high contracting parties should have notified twelve months before the expiration of the five years the intention of terminating it, it shall remain binding until the expiration of one year from the day on which either of the high contracting parties shall have renounced it. But if, when the date fixed for its expiration arrives, either ally is actually engaged in war, the alliance shall, *ipso facto*, continue until peace is concluded.

In faith whereof the undersigned, duly authorized by their respective Governments, have signed this agreement and have affixed thereto their seals.

LANSDOWNE.
HAYASHI.

In order that we may better understand the motives that led to the formation of this treaty, it will be well to recall some of the more important features of the situation in the Orient. About ten years ago the influence of England was the dominant influence in the Far East, politically as well as commercially. But, owing to a weak foreign policy on the part of the British Government and a shrewd, aggressive policy on the part of Russia, the latter has supplanted England so far as the Chinese Court is concerned, so that Russian influence is easily the greatest influence at Peking. Put in the language of the Stock Exchange, the diplomatic market at the Chinese capital has changed from "bullish" to "bearish." Nor can this change be attributed to the Transvaal war, as it had been effected before that war began. It was evident when Russia secured possession of Port Arthur, and even painfully so in the negotiations following the Chino-Japanese war. In these negotiations the voice of England was entirely disregarded.

As the English commercial interests are still the greatest of

those of any of the European powers in the East, it seemed clear that something should be done to regain if possible her former political prestige, or at any rate to put herself in a position to protect her industrial and commercial interests; and, despairing of any alliance with the United States, an alliance with Japan seemed the most available means. On the part of Japan the motive is sufficiently clear—she is desirous of protecting herself against a coalition similar to the one that robbed her of the fruits of her victory over China.

The treaty is evidently aimed at Russia, and its purpose is clearly to check her advance in the East. How far it will be successful in this depends more upon the understanding back of the treaty than upon the treaty itself. It is not at all unreasonable to suppose that this understanding does as a matter of fact run much deeper than the wording of the treaty would indicate. At any rate, it is usual to state treaties of this sort in as mild terms as can conveniently be chosen. True, there are cases in which stronger terms than the facts would warrant are resorted to for the purpose of "bluffing," yet that can hardly be true of the present agreement. If it is, the "high contracting parties" have shown poor judgment, for it should be evident to both of them that Russian statesmen are not such amateurs in diplomacy that a "bluff" would be very effective in turning them from their purpose.

The Russians will not fail to test the strength of the treaty, and if it appears that any considerable portion thereof is "bluff" the position of England and Japan will have been weakened rather than strengthened by it. If on the other hand the two powers have determined to act in concert, much may be accomplished by their combined efforts. Provided both of them have reached the conclusion that the "defense of their respective interests" is of sufficient importance to warrant it, and the only effective method is a resort to force, it would not be difficult for them to find at any time that these interests are "threatened either by the aggressive action of some other power or by disturbances in China and Corea." This startling discovery could of course be made simultaneously by England

and Japan. Nor is there anything in the treaty to prevent them from seeking redress simultaneously.

This line of action, if persisted in, would undoubtedly call a halt on Russia, for in the event of an appeal to arms the odds would be against her. The Japanese army could seize Corea before Russia could get her troops "on the ground," and being so much nearer its base of supplies would have a tremendous advantage in the land-fighting; while on the water the British and Japanese navy could easily sweep from the seas that of Russia or those of Russia and such allies as she is at all likely to secure. With the sea in control of England and Japan, Russia's ally or allies could not render her any very great assistance in the land-fighting.

I have used the term *allies*, although France is the only power from which Russia could reasonably hope for assistance. The interests of Germany are not such that she could afford to enter the contest. The United States would of course remain neutral, unless forced into the contest by a combination of events that there is no reason to expect. If, however, we should be drawn into the struggle, our interests are such that it is not at all difficult to foresee upon which side we would be found.

Apart from an appeal to force, the alliance, if it is at all substantial, will render the Chinese Government less likely to yield to Russian demands, and will for some time to come dissuade Russia from levying discriminating duties in Manchuria. In short, it will secure for the present a recognition of the "open door" policy in China. How much it will add to England's prestige in the Far East is a question that time alone can answer. In general, an alliance does not add to a nation's prestige; it is a confession of weakness rather than an evidence of strength.

One of the incidental effects of the treaty is the recognition of Japan as a first-class power. While such recognition or the want of it does not alter the facts, it is a matter not without diplomatic significance as well as a source of gratification to Japan. The latter is very evident from the tone of the Japanese press, by which the treaty is looked upon as an epoch-making

document. I was recently told by a Japanese scholar, who has spent several years in the Foreign Office of Japan, that it is the most important event in the politics of the Orient since the treaty of Shimonoseki. His only criticism of the treaty was that the United States is not a party to it—his contention being that, as the United States will reap the benefit of it, she should help bear the burdens.

To Europe the treaty comes as a surprise, and the press comments are somewhat varied in character. However, with the exception of Russia, they all agree that it is aimed at the Czar's empire. The Russians insist that the policy of maintenance of the *status quo*, the open door, peace, etc., set forth in this treaty, are just what they themselves have always contended for, and that the treaty is therefore a very welcome document to Russia. Yet there are those to be found, even in the United States, who are sufficiently malicious to suggest that Russia's joy is not sincere.

EDWIN MAXEY.

The University of Wisconsin.

POPULAR ELECTION OF UNITED STATES SENATORS.

THE sentiment in favor of the popular election of United States Senators is gradually growing stronger and stronger. On February 13 the fourth resolution providing for the election of Senators by direct vote of the people was passed by the House of Representatives. This fact is significant, for whatever may have been the individual opinions of the Representatives themselves they have given by their vote a positive demonstration of their interpretation of the public will on the question. A more conclusive proof that the people favor this change cannot under the circumstances be reasonably asked for; yet those who oppose this change, and foremost among them Senator Hoar, refuse to see in this action of the House any indication of a real public desire for this change. The Senator just mentioned even went so far as to state on the floor of the Senate that in his opinion the House had passed this bill "as half a joke." There is little evidence, however, to show that one branch of our national legislature permitted a resolution advocating an amendment to the Constitution to pass without any opposition "as half a joke."

There is no doubt that the people generally favor this new method of election, and when the people of the United States seriously advocate any political innovation it becomes the duty of all earnest public men to make this innovation the object of their thoughtful attention. There are many who claim that, since this proposition involves an amendment to the Constitution, those who favor it have assumed a difficult burden of proof and must show beyond all reasonable doubt that the proposed change is positively better than the present system of selecting Senators. This is true to a certain extent; yet it might be answered that, in a country whose political dogma is the sovereign will of the people, when the people unite in

demanding a certain change it becomes the duty of all opposing them to show good reasons why they should not have it. The people want the popular election of United States Senators, and we hope to show clearly that there is to-day no sound reason why public opinion should not be followed in this instance. This argument of the popular desire will appeal to many; it is indifferent to very few, and will be opposed chiefly by those who have selfish interests to guard.

P.V.B

There are, however, several sound and positive arguments for the election of Senators by direct vote of the people. First among them is that this new method is the logical outcome of our political development, and is quite in accord with our ideals of government to-day. To look upon this question historically we must go back to the time of the birth of our Constitution. This step is important and necessary, as our knowledge of the past and present aids us in our efforts to foresee the future. But this attempt to seek advice from the past is often dangerous. Influenced by a natural and just regard for the sound opinions of the framers of our Constitution, we are very apt to overlook the fact that these men drew many of their conclusions from premises that no longer exist and while they were influenced by conditions that we have great difficulty in thoroughly realizing to-day. In wondering at the stability of the great document drawn up by these men, we too often forget that this stability is quite as much the result of the sound political sense of the American people as it is of any inherent qualities of the Constitution itself. Few people familiar with the subject ignore the fact that our Constitution to-day differs much in spirit if not in letter from that Constitution which was the result of the mutual ideals and concessions of the members of the Convention of 1787. And yet many of us fail to take this fact into due consideration when we freely quote the opinions of these men upon specific questions of the present day.

Many opinions quite rational in 1787 would be ridiculous in 1902. Because our forefathers believed in a certain method of selecting Senators over a hundred years ago is no reason for

supposing that they would favor it to-day. Every student of history knows that the political development of the United States has been a gradual change from the aristocratic and conservative ideals of the framers of our Government to the popular democratic ideas of to-day; that the doctrine of the sovereign will of the people has ceased to be our abstract philosophic theory of political resources, and has become a live, practical, every-day principle of the politician. Newspapers, railroads, telegraphs, and accumulated political experience have in the course of time become some of the main causes of this change. When communication between the States was difficult; when the average citizen had merely local interests—little knowledge of State affairs and less of national; when to many Americans a newspaper was a novelty and to all of them a railroad or a telegraph was a dream, we can see the wisdom of those men who wished to keep direct power from a people who for unavoidable reasons had not acquired that political knowledge which is essential to the proper exercise of sovereign power in politics. But to-day, under present conditions, these same statesmen and patriots would undoubtedly be of another opinion.

Remembering the condition of affairs in 1787, we can easily understand how the State legislatures elected the governors and all other officers, civil and military, of the State (even the members of the Constitutional Convention themselves were chosen by the several State legislatures); how the President was intended to be selected by electors; how property and even religious qualifications were retained in several of the States as absolutely essential to the privilege of voting. But by to-day many changes have taken place. Our President is practically elected by popular vote; so are the governors of the States. Civil and military officers are no longer appointed by the legislatures, and property qualifications are generally abolished. And it is not an extravagant supposition to believe that the framers of our Constitution would to-day applaud these changes in the great instrument of their own creation. But this change, great as it is, is not yet complete. We have still

the choice of United States Senators by the legislatures to remind us of the days when the people were not trusted, and to remind us also that there remains still something for us to do in order to make the doctrine of popular rights everywhere a practical proposition rather than an abstract idea. These several steps in this great change have been gradual, and therein lies the stability of our institutions; but we claim, and we believe not rashly, that the time has now come to make this change, and that it follows in logical sequence with the others. To hold otherwise is to claim that a people that has made such wonderful advances in commerce, industry, and in civilization has remained at a standstill in politics. This argument of the historic necessity of this change gains in strength the longer and more attentively we consider it.

Another argument in favor of the change we propose is that the present method of choosing Senators is quite inconsistent with our political ideals of to-day. A republican form of government should avoid all inconsistencies in its composition. They form a great element of weakness, not only from the fact that they destroy the harmony of the system on which the government is based, but because they expose the government to the frequent natural and adverse criticism of the people and thereby lessen that popular respect which is so essential to the strength of any institution founded on the will of the people. Political anomalies can be supported only by selfish class interests, by narrow bigotry, or by that timid and senseless conservatism which, forgetting that progress is an irresistible law, looks with dread upon all changes. We claim that the present method of choosing our national Senators has grown to be one of these dangerous political anomalies. It fitted logically into the scheme of our government when it was framed, but it is not in keeping with its spirit in the year 1902. When the people are considered capable of directly electing every four years a President who represents the entire nation, why should it be considered dangerous to allow them to choose directly two men who represent their State? Are not these two contradictory principles an excellent example of that dangerous in-

consistency just referred to? This question is all the more difficult to answer negatively when we remember that the President is nearly always a man of another State, and that the people know far less about him personally than about their own Senators. It may be claimed that in voting for the President the people are voting for a party; but this is quite as true of the Senators. It may also be argued that the people of one State alone do not elect a President; but it is quite as true that the people of one State cannot control the Senate,

B. Again, the position of Chief Executive may be filled by the people acting all at one time and under the predominating influence of one agitated question, while the people can fill the Senate only after expressing their will in three separate parts and under the influence of three successive periods. Perhaps it will be said that periods of two or six years are nothing in politics. This may be true, but the effects of a continued popular excitement of a longer period would invade the Senate even if the State legislatures shield them from the terrible influences of popular enthusiasm. (Furthermore, it is far from being the mere assertion of a demagogue to insist that to hold the people incapable of electing Senators is an insidious reflection upon the dignity of a nation whose political creed is the sovereignty of the people; and this the more so as these same people elect directly every four years the executive branch of the government whose hasty or foolish acts entail quite as great disaster as the similar action of one-half of the legislature. Surely these two principles of election are quite inconsistent.) Again, our national legislature does not elect representatives of the nation, and why should the State legislature elect those of the State? Every State in the Union has a senate, and its members are chosen by direct vote of the people. In fact, all the agents of the people with the single exception of the national Senators are practically selected either by popular vote or by executive appointment. It is true that the legislatures exercise a certain control over executive appointments, but that does not alter the fact that the present method of selecting Senators is inconsistent with our ideals and our practise.

3 Another consideration in favor of popular election is that it would not impair the efficiency of the Senate in any way, and would be beneficial to the Senators themselves. Our opponents usually put forward the claim that the Senate is a check upon the House, and then imply that this would not be the case under the system we propose. The Senate should no doubt exercise a certain restraining influence over the House. Many different opinions have existed on this subject, but to-day the only sound principle is that the Senate being elected for a longer term than the House, and being composed of older and usually more prominent men, represents the more permanent interests of the nation which at certain moments are apt to be disregarded; while the House is more responsive to the momentary impulses of the people. To disregard the longer term, the more advanced age, and the greater prominence of the Senators, and then to claim that their acknowledged conservatism and dignity are based solely or even principally upon their manner of election is ridiculous. To say that the Senate would be, under the new method of election, a second House of Representatives is to declare that every State in the Union has two houses of representatives. It has often been said that the popular election of Senators will shorten the average time during which the Senators will remain in office. There is doubtless some truth in this statement, but its force is greatly diminished when we think of the large number of Representatives who have spent a great part of their lives in the lower House even though the people had every two years a chance of changing them. Then, again, it is not positively demonstrated that it is very essential for the Senators generally to remain several terms. If after an opportunity of six years a Senator cannot publicly demonstrate his worth it is perhaps just as well to give another an opportunity. The upper branch of our Legislature is not a school where the Senators are supposed to remain several terms before becoming capable statesmen. Furthermore, a Senator must watch his constituents and should under ordinary conditions strive to be honestly reelected. It is far more dignified as well as more profitable for a Senator to sound the

people at different times than it is for him to watch the State legislatures. Since he ought to know the wishes of his people, is it not better for him to find them out directly? A Senator can well afford to strive to remain in touch with the people, but to keep in communication with a certain section of every third legislature is undignified to say the least.

4 This new method of electing Senators would be very beneficial to the State legislatures. These are elected primarily to consider local and State affairs, and it is better that they should not be hampered with national obligations. This is all the more true when we remember that the choice of a Senator has many times occupied the entire session of a legislature; that Senatorial dead-locks are not of infrequent occurrence; that the election of a Senator has often divided the legislature into two hostile sections; that it has sometimes split the party in power and thereby disrupted its working harmony; that the question as to how a person will vote for Senators has become an important but illegitimate factor in his qualification for the State legislature, and furthermore that this personal question relative to the selection of Senators is something foreign to our ideals of the deliberations of a legislative assembly. It may be claimed that depriving the State legislatures of the right they now possess will be injuring rather than aiding them. But we are relieving them of a duty which is inconsistent with their other duties, and which is often disastrous in its results, as has just been shown. Again, the choice of the State governors and of all civil and military officers has been removed from the State legislatures, and why should we stop when we reach the Senators? Why should we hesitate to make this change in order to continue our gradual progress toward the absolute rule of the people? It is the growth from which we derive strength, and one which it is dangerous to attempt to prevent.

5 Finally, one important argument in favor of popular election is that it would be of great political value to the people themselves. The great store of political learning and experience which the railroads, telegraphs, and newspapers have aided in placing before the people is not always readily absorbed. There

is no doubt that the people do not take entire advantage of their opportunities in this respect, and it is equally undeniable that the Government should do all in its power to encourage either directly or indirectly the acquisition of political knowledge and experience by the people, because on the political foresight and ability of the people depends absolutely the welfare of all democratic governments. During times of political excitement and when called upon to choose by election their representatives the people acquire almost involuntarily a certain lesson in practical politics. The election of the Representatives is often a comparatively local affair and brings up usually but the discussion of local issues. All the other elections with one notable exception in which the people take a direct part are State elections, and the issues discussed are semi-local. But then every four years the people are called upon to choose the Chief Executive of the entire nation. There is no real medium step between the popular election of a State officer and that of the President of the United States. From the discussion of State issues and the consideration of State interests the people are suddenly called upon to give their opinion on the greatest questions of the political category—on questions that involve the vital interests of the nation as a whole. Now, the popular election of Senators would supply that salutary and essential medium step. By this act the people would be instructed to a certain extent in national politics before being called upon to voice their opinion on a national issue. It is true that the people elect only two Senators every six years, but the very fact that they are elected by the people and that they are directly responsible to the people would naturally bring them in closer touch with the people—to the great benefit of the latter. To-day a Senator does not fear popular criticism to so great an extent, but under the proposed method he would feel a more direct and immediate although not necessarily a greater responsibility and would therefore see to it that the people understood his actions in order to approve them.

Before summoning these several strong arguments in favor of the popular election of Senators we wish to discuss in gen-

eral terms a few of the points usually advanced for and against this proposition. It has often been claimed, especially by those who favor this change, that the Senate is a body of millionaires and that many of its members have a corrupt control over the State legislatures. The truth of these statements we attempt neither to prove nor to deny, but we do claim that there is no logical connection between the individual financial condition of the Senators, or the undue influence of some of them over State legislatures, and the question of their election by the people. Changing the Constitution is not the proper way to lessen the aggregate wealth of the Senators, even if it were clearly demonstrated that our interests would be better served by a set of men who are constantly experiencing the annoyances of an income short of their needs. Nor should we amend the Constitution merely to allay the general but often unwarranted suspicions of corruption. If some of the State legislatures are corrupt, a constitutional amendment is a very slow and indirect method of attacking such an evil. If a State will for any length of time submit to a corrupt legislature, it will not be long before its representatives in Washington will be equally corrupt even under the system we propose. Again, corrupt representatives who remain any length of time are usually good representatives of the State that permits it. There are many cases in which the law can do much to check corruption, but this is not one of them.

Furthermore, it is a very astonishing as well as regrettable fact that the word *corruption* is of such importance in the argumentative vocabulary of so many of our politicians. In fact, unfounded charges and rhetorical descriptions of corruption have become so common a political weapon in this country that one meets with them in the discussion of every subject, whether the speakers are high-school debaters or members of our highest political bodies. It is usually a cowardly weapon and one that has been so misused that it now takes little effect even in cases where it has direct and positive application. We are so accustomed to false charges of this kind that many true ones are refused our attention on the ground that they are probably

the usual exaggerations. These charges have a most demoralizing influence. Believe all and we have few honest people left; believe none and many wretches escape; try to discriminate between false and true and the usual hopelessness of the task almost justifies one in giving up in despair. We therefore repeat all the more positively that the argument of corruption should not enter into the discussion of this question.

It may furthermore be claimed that this constitutional amendment is unnecessary as the people can virtually elect the Senators by giving instructions to the members of their State legislatures as they are elected. Some of the States have already adopted this plan, and with some success. The present method of electing the President may be cited as a change brought about without greatly altering the letter of the Constitution. But this is not a strictly parallel case. Again, this idea with reference to our State legislatures is not in keeping with our ideals of government. An elector and a representative in the legislature are and should be distinctly different. One is chosen for a special purpose and furnished with a definite mandate from the people, which he is under a binding moral obligation not to violate; while the other, although guided by certain party principles and legitimate local interests, is supposed to use his own judgment, and above all he is even expected to make certain necessary concessions and thereby obtain as nearly as possible the wishes of his people. An elector on the other hand is supposed to execute positive instructions. To combine these two in one person is confusing and dangerous, as a man may be a good representative and yet refuse to be an elector. Again, our Constitution positively forbids the members of our national legislature to become electors, and why should we favor making electors out of the members of State legislatures? This entire argument is the timid and negative reason of those who believe that it is better to distort and violate the letter of the Constitution than to amend it.

It has also been stated that the popular election of Senators would weaken the doctrine of States' rights. This may be true, and the question as to whether this is advisable or not would

lead us far from the present subject of our discussion. But those who fear this should remember that the Democratic party, which is surely not hostile to the States' rights doctrine, adopted this method of election in its last platform; that many of the States favoring this change are the small States, and also that the advocates of this doctrine are intrenched behind a clause in the Constitution which declares that "no State without its consent shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate," and that the power of amendment is of no avail against this statement. This is the usual argument of those who would very much like to prove that equal representation of the States, as well as the dignity and conservatism of the Senate as a body, depends entirely or even in part upon the selection of the Senators by the State legislatures.

Before ending our discussion of the arguments advanced against this new method of choosing Senators, we wish to say just a few words regarding the statements of Senators Hoar and Stewart during a recent short debate on this question in the Senate. To quote from the first mentioned Senator:

"This is one of the most important questions that have come up for consideration in the Congress of the United States since the adoption of the Constitution. It is the first serious proposition to destroy the principle upon which the Constitution is founded or to depart from it. Other amendments have either been amendments to secure human rights, in the nature of a bill of rights or in one instance to change the mechanism for the election of a President; but this is a proposition to change the principle upon which the Constitution is founded—a principle without the adoption of which it is notorious as a matter of history the Constitution never would have been agreed to."

It will be seen that the Senator has a great appreciation of the importance of this proposed amendment; yet he does not hesitate to say: "It is true the House of Representatives have passed this proposition. It has been passed every time without debate there, I think as half a joke." According to the Senator this amendment is of such vast importance that it is not even to be considered in the same category as the amendments "securing human rights" or "changing the mechanism for the

election of President." To change the method of election of President is apparently nothing, while to change the method of selecting Senators is "to change the principle upon which the Constitution is founded." Again, the Senator is quite wrong in his appeal to history. The question of the method of choosing Senators was quite a minor consideration in the Convention of 1787. The great question was the equal representation of the States. There is no logical connection between these two questions, except in the minds of those who purposely connect and confuse the two.

The Senator said, furthermore: "The question is, which speaks to us with the most authority—the House of Representatives of to-day, without deliberation or discussion, or the Constitutional Convention of 1787, after long debate and anxious deliberation?" In the first place, there was no "long debate or anxious deliberation" on this question in the Convention; but, granting that there had been, is this a fair way to argue? Is this the way to discuss questions in the Senate? Such argument is not serious, to say the least. And yet the Senator says: "I am willing to go to any representative assembly of intelligent American people and meet this proposition to strike at the very heart of our Constitution. . . . It is worth waiting six weeks to see whether we are going to strike down one of the two great glories of our Republic and let it perish from the face of the earth. I for one mean to do my duty on that committee; but I will not be hurried, and the Senate shall not be hurried, if I can help it." Here are the sentiments of one member of the committee to which our resolution is confided. Judging from his statements in this debate, it is hard to believe that Senator Hoar has given this question any serious attention, or that he has made the slightest effort to consider it without prejudice. And yet can we expect him to be less prejudicial or more clear-sighted in committee than he was on the floor of the Senate?

The remarks of Senator Hoar were indorsed by Senator Stewart, who besides using the old arguments of corruption, bossism, etc., to combat our proposition, said: "I am glad the

Senator from Massachusetts has called attention to the magnitude of this question. It is revolutionary. It is the most important question discussed since the adoption of the Constitution." Does the Senator mean to imply that changing the method of electing Senators is going to bring about a revolution? If not, then why does he say so? Does he consider this amendment of greater importance than that giving freedom to millions of negroes? Do these two Senators unknowingly or purposely confuse this question of popular election with that of the equal representation of the States? In either case they are much to blame. Let us hope this is not an example of the fairness with which our proposition is finally to be discussed in the Senate of the United States.

To conclude our discussion, we favor this new method of electing Senators—because the people wish it, and there is no sound reason why their wish should not be granted; because it is the logical outcome of our political development and is in accord with our ideals of government to-day; because the present method has grown to be inconsistent with our ideals and practises; because the new method would not in the least impair the efficiency of the Senate, and because it would be a decided advantage to the Senators, the State legislatures, and the people themselves.

CHARLES JAMES FOX.

Washington, D. C.

JAPANESE BUDDHISM.

I. ITS PHILOSOPHIC AND DOCTRINAL TEACHINGS.

"Let a man overcome anger by love; let him overcome evil by good; let him overcome greediness by liberality, and the liar by truth." "Hatred does not cease by hatred at any time; hatred ceases by love."

"If a man does what is good, let him do it again; let him delight in it; happiness is the outcome of goodness."

"Even a good man sees evil days, as long as his good deed has not ripened; but when his good deed has ripened, then does the good man see happy days."

"The virtuous man delights in this world; he delights in the next; and he delights in both. He delights, he rejoices, when he sees the purity of his own work."

"Reflection is the path of immortality—thoughtlessness the path of death. Those who reflect do not die. Those who are thoughtless are as if dead already."

"Health is the greatest of gifts—contentedness the best riches. Truth is the best of relatives—Nirvana the highest happiness."

—From Max Müller's translation of "Dhanurapada" (*Science of Religion*).

THE above are some of the precepts taught by Buddha.

The teaching of Buddha, says Sir Edwin Arnold, has made Asia mild. Prof. Max Müller confirms this view by saying: "Even the attention of those who are indifferent to all that concerns religion must be arrested for a moment when they learn from the statistical account that no religion, not even the Christians', has exercised so powerful an influence on the diminution of crime as the old simple doctrine of the ascetic of Kapilavastu." We also hear from the lips of a Catholic priest (Bishop Bagaudet) that "in reading the particulars of the life of the last Buddha, Gautama, it is impossible not to feel reminded of many circumstances relating to our Saviour's life, such as it has been sketched out by the Evangelists." Further, Prof. L. A. Waddell, in relating the Buddhist metaphysics, says: "Karma, or the ethical doctrine of retribution, is accepted as its general principle, even by such modern men of science as Huxley."

These words are not exaggeration. Think not that truth

is a monopoly of any particular race; for, on the contrary, it is found everywhere. Think not that truth is a mere fancy of man; for, on the contrary, it is a network of the Universe, which reveals itself through a great, godlike person. Thus, Jesus of Nazareth, Mahomet of Mecca, Buddha Gautama of Kapilavastu, Lao-tsze and Confucius of China—all have preached a more or less similar truth. The recognition of this fact is religious toleration. It is gratifying to see people growing day by day broad minded, and scholars bringing various religious thoughts into light. A comparative study of religions, like a comparative study of anatomy or morphology, helps us to gain a greater insight into the absolute truth. With this idea in view, I propose to state briefly the doctrine of Buddhism as understood by the Japanese.

Most Japanese Buddhists belong to the so-called Mahayana sect of Buddhism, and but few to the Hinayana sect. Roughly speaking, Mahayana Buddhism prevails in Nepal, Thibet, China, Manchuria, Mongolia, Corea, and Japan, with no less than four hundred million believers; and Hinayana Buddhism prevails in Ceylon, Burmah, and Siam, with nearly ten million adherents. Many European scholars condemn the Mahayana doctrine as heretical. This may be a just criticism, but the teacher of Mahayana is not, in consequence of this, untrue. On the contrary, one would understand, by studying how the later Buddhism was developed from the original, that the heretical doctrine was the necessary outcome of the orthodox.

Hinayana is called in Japanese "Shojo" (a small vehicle, or small conveyance of doctrine), and Mahayana is called "Daijo" (a great vehicle, or great conveyance of doctrine). The teaching of Hinayana is pure and simple. It may be summed up in the following phrases:

Shogyo mujo—Impermanence of things;

Shoho muga—Non-ego of creatures; and

Jakumetsuiraku—Bliss of extinction.

1.—Impermanence of things. Like the modern materialists, the Hinayana Buddhists believe that things constantly change on account of their composite structure—because every com-

pound thing must be decomposed, every organic body must be disorganized, and every living being must die and decay; while, on the other hand, the matured propagates an offspring, in which a deceased entity's "karma" simultaneously incarnates. This newly-born creature assimilates various materials and forms another organism. Further, Buddhists say that even atoms and molecules are subject to a similar change—they are continually made and unmade; *i. e.*, they are perpetually undergoing the process of regeneration. Therefore, every body composed of atoms changes at every instant.

2.—Non-ego of creatures. Not only body, but also *mind* undergoes a similar change; for mind is a compound of sensations, ideas, and superstitions, each of which is subject to the law of perpetual change. Buddha said: "But that, O priest, which is called mind, intellect, consciousness keeps up an incessant round by day and by night of perishing as one thing and springing up as another." Should *ego* mean such a thing as mind, ego will at each moment change and in the end perish. Should it mean, on the contrary, a metaphysical entity permanent and indestructible, then a question will arise: Where do we find such an entity; do we find it behind sensations, ideas, and predispositions? In the following extract we find the same discussion dealt with by Buddha himself:

"In the above case, Ananda, where it is said: 'Verily, neither is sensation my ego, nor does my ego have no sensation; my ego has sensation; my ego possesses the faculty of sensation,' reply should be made as follows: 'Suppose, brother, that utterly and completely, and without remainder, all sensations were to cease—if there were nowhere any sensation—pray, would there be anything, after the cessation of sensation, of which it would be said, "This am I?"' "Nay, verily, reverend sir." Accordingly, Ananda, it is not possible to hold the view: 'Verily, neither is sensation my ego, nor does my ego have no sensation; my ego has sensation; my ego possesses the faculty of sensation.'"

In another place Buddha more emphatically denied the existence of the ego. In him (a Brahman who used to believe in ego), thus unwisely considering (says Buddha), there

springs up one or other of six absurd notions. He gets the notion, "I have a self; I have a not-self; by myself I am conscious of myself; by myself I am conscious of my not-self!" Or again he gets the notion, "This soul of mine can be perceived; it has experienced the result of good and evil actions committed here and there; now, this soul of mine is permanent, lasting, eternal—has inherent quality of never changing, and will continue forever!" This, brethren, is called "the walking in delusion, the jingle of delusion, the wilderness of delusion, the puppet show of delusion."

From such a wrong assertion of the ego, teaches Buddha, springs a selfish motive, calling this and that "mine." From such a selfish motive arise various vices, evil thought, ambition, longing for sensual pleasure, and clinging to existence. From these arise trouble, hatred, disappointment, sorrow, and lamentation. Again, from the clinging to life, arises "unconscious will to live" (ignorance), which causes a rebirth. In the newly-born life man finds his position (either in a good or bad family) and predisposition (either as a good or bad man) all predetermined by his previous deeds—Karma; for a bad seed sown at any time will in the future bear bad fruit, and a good seed good fruit. The causal nexus is an iron monarch who determines the fate of the individual according to his deeds. Again, this causal nexus may be compared to the wheel of life—carrying men from birth to death and from death to birth, without end.

3.—Bliss of extinction. Hence, man must endeavor to relieve himself from this tyrannical chain and attain absolute freedom and supreme bliss in Nirvana. In order to reach this goal he must become thoroughly unselfish, clearly understanding that *ego* does not exist. He must regard his neighbors and even the lower animals as one with himself. Through such an enlightened knowledge and deed, his desire for sensual pleasure ceases—as also his unconscious will to live. In other words, he conquers his ignorance, which is, according to Buddhism, the very foundation of finite existence—so trying and miserable. Thus, by conquering his ignorance, he becomes free from the tyrannical rule of the causal nexus, or wheel of life. Buddha said:

"It is through not understanding and grasping four conditions (four things), O brethren, that we have had to run so long in the weary path of individuality, both you and I. And what are these four? The noble conduct of life, the noble earnestness of meditation, the noble kind of wisdom, and the noble salvation of freedom. But when the noble kind of conduct of life, of earnestness in meditation, of wisdom, and of salvation by freedom are seen face to face, and are comprehended, there is the craving for existence rooted out, that which leads to renewed existence is destroyed, and there is no more birth."

Thus through perfect enlightenment man enters Nirvana and ceases to exist. Nirvana and extinction are synonymous. Hence, "extinction" means supreme bliss. This conclusion is apparently a self-contradiction, but in reality it is not. The whole mystery lies in this—that the southern Buddhists refuse to entertain an idea of future existence; for such an opinion itself is egoistic and spoils the noble enlightenment. Rhys-Davids rightly remarks: "So that not only is the Arahat (one who is qualified for attainment of Nirvana) to look for no reward, no happiness, which he himself is to be conscious of hereafter, but . . . any hope of a future life is really even worse than unfounded: it is declared to be an actual impediment in the way of the only object that we ought to seek after, namely, the attainment in this world of the state of mental and ethical culture summed up in the word *Arahatsip*."

The Mahayana sect is divided into many sub-sects, each of which has its own system of philosophy. The doctrine of Mahayana Buddhism is, therefore, manifold. There are the systems of atheism and theism, polytheism and pantheism, agnosticism and gnosticism, pessimism and optimism, materialism and nihilism, realism and idealism. It seems almost impossible to embrace all these antagonistic schools of philosophy in a single religion; but in reality it is possible, since these different systems of philosophy are but different aspects of Absolute Truth, for they are different explanations of human life and its relation to the Universe from several points of view. I will state briefly the philosophy of the *Idealistic* creed of Buddhism.

In order to understand the Buddhist Idealism, we must first study the Buddhist psychology. The Mahayana Buddhists classify the psychological functions of man into eight groups: (1) Visual sensation; (2) Auditory sensation; (3) Smell sensation; (4) Taste sensation; (5) Tactile and movement sensation; (6) Will; (7) Self-consciousness; (8) Unconscious reserve of experience.

The first five groups are instruments of the remaining three.

Will is, according to the Buddhist psychology, doer, thinker, and feeler. In other words, will is a certain state of consciousness that precedes, or a certain conscious activity that underlies, action, thought, and emotion. In case a man acts after a certain deliberation, the deliberation is will; in case he gathers various ideas with a certain effort, and thinks, the effort is will. Again, a man often becomes sympathetic by giving his attention to the poor; he grows angry by giving his attention to maltreatment; he feels gratified by giving his attention to an agreeable affair, and he feels dissatisfied by giving his attention to a disagreeable affair. In these cases the attention is will; therefore, in the Japanese language, attention is called "chui," which means a pouring or extending of will toward a certain object. In short, deliberation, effort, and attention are several names for a certain mental faculty, which is called by the Buddhists *will*. Will is, therefore, a responsible agent for good or bad conduct, thought, and emotion. It is also with this will that a man forms a false conception of a private ego; that he becomes attached to a worldly existence; that he indulges in sensual pleasure; that he grows selfish, malicious, and criminal.

Self-consciousness is a judge of right or wrong conduct, thought, and emotion. It is an opinion of the whole—the total experience of man. This total experience is contained in the "unconscious reserve of experience."

Let us see how each experience becomes preserved in the "unconscious reserve." Buddhists recognize that sense-perception, conception, emotion, thought, will, action, and judgment are all transitory, for they appear in the consciousness at one moment and disappear in the next; but they also recognize

that these experiences leave some permanent impression on the mind. Suppose I solve a mathematical problem; my calculation or thinking will pass away as soon as I reach the conclusion. Now, will not my thinking leave something in my mind? Shall I not hereafter be able to solve a similar problem much more quickly? Is this not because of the previous experience? Truly, the previous experience leaves something in my mind. This something is called by the Buddhists *seed*—that which bears fruit in the future. Thus we constantly sow mental seeds through our daily experience.

Experience may be either receptive or active. A child's experience is largely receptive, while man's experience is largely active. The first is mostly sense-perception; the second is voluntary actions, thoughts, or emotions. The one is incoming experience; the other is outgoing experience. It is self-evident that an incoming experience would add a new seed to the "unconscious reserve." Would an outgoing experience also add a new seed? Suppose a man tries to recollect a horse he saw a few months ago. Do you think that he can reproduce in his consciousness exactly the same sensations he received while looking at the horse? Assuredly not. Memory and perception are different things; therefore, a recollection is to be regarded as a new experience. So, also, thought or will is a new experience. Thus, through each recollection, thought, emotion, or will, we add a new seed to the "unconscious reserve."

All the Idealistic Buddhists believe that this "unconscious reserve" transmigrates from one life to another. When it is incarnated in a new organism, it becomes what we call consciousness, predisposition, and natural endowment. Then it follows that the "unconscious reserve" in the present life embraces all the previous experiences gained in the infinite past. It includes those experiences gained during the evolutionary stages of beast, bird, fish, vertebrate, and what not. Therefore, the sum total of the previous experiences in each person represents each section of the Universe; consequently, an absolute consciousness of such infinite experiences would afford a knowledge of the Universe.

Let us now examine the metaphysics of the Idealistic school of Buddhism. There are three key-notes: illusion, objective experience, and perfection of true nature.

1.—Illusion. Illusion is the principle common to all the sects of Buddhism. By Illusion the Hinayana Buddhists mean "ignorance of the truth of impermanence," and the Mahayana Buddhists mean "ignorance of the unreality of things." Objective materials are, according to Mahayana Buddhism, representations of reality in our consciousness. They are what appear to us, not what *is*. They are phenomenal realities, not *Shinnio*, or things-in-themselves (to borrow the words of Kant). Since our knowledge is relative and our perceptions are limited by our sense organs, we finite beings cannot comprehend the so-called *Shinnio*, or Absolute Reality. The common people instinctively hold the view that whatever things they see through their eyes are absolutely real. In holding this view, they assume that their eyes are capable of infinite perception. But how can they see a thing in the moon? How can they see the dimension and quality of an atom? The extent to which their perception can reach is a little mound compared to the whole universe. That which their eyes can penetrate is mere surface or rough outline, and even that is not actually *seen*.

Man is imprisoned in a small chamber having two windows called eyes. He only sees a shadow of reality on his prison walls. The common people call such a shadow reality itself. In this way they walk in delusion, for their life is limited to those visible things. They see every day many criminals escaping from legal punishment and living comparatively happy. Thus they believe that bad conduct often brings forth good results; and they disbelieve the most important truth of Karma—that good conduct always brings forth good results and bad conduct bad results, if not in this generation assuredly in the next. The truth of Karma and the truth of continuity of life are torchlights thrown into darkness. But people do not recognize these lights and are content in their darkness; they do not see the light but perceive the darkness. This is the "walking in delusion" and the "fetters of delusion."

2.—Objective experience. According to the Idealistic theory of Buddhism, there is only one way of approaching the Absolute. This is the objective experience, which is twofold: (1) the intellectual exercise and (2) the moral discipline. (1) Because a knowledge of Absolute Reality is possible only through the absolute knowledge; an absolute knowledge is possible only through a generalization of an infinite number of relative knowledges; and a relative knowledge is possible only through the careful learning of established doctrines and through the persistent study of phenomenal realities. (2) Because a realization of Absolute Reality is possible only through the perpetual working in accordance with the absolute truth. Obedience to the absolute truth is possible only by having achieved the all-relative truths on moral precepts. Again, from the point of view of the Absolute, say the Buddhists, everything is equal. Equality means fraternity, and fraternity means love. Buddha said: "Let his [a monk's] mind pervade one quarter of the world with the thought of love; and so the second; and so the third; and so the fourth. And thus the whole world—above, below, around, and everywhere—does he continue to pervade with heart of love, far reaching, grown great, and beyond measure."

3.—Perfection of the true nature. We have already seen that each experience adds a new seed to the so-called "unconscious reserve of experience." Only through correct knowledge and upright conduct do we increase good seeds; while, on the other hand, only through wrong knowledge and unrighteous conduct do we increase bad seeds. The planting of good seeds in our minds is a step toward the Absolute; while, on the other hand, the planting of bad seeds in our minds is a step opposite to the Absolute. Therefore, by accumulating in our "unconscious reserve" an infinite number of good seeds and apperceiving them all in our consciousness, we complete our true nature—we become an absolute knower, or Buddha. Then we can see everything from the right side. We see nothing ugly, but everything beautiful. Even the fire of hell would turn pale before our glory. All the wicked would cease before our breath.

Everybody would, through our influence, grow good and happy. This is Nirvana. This is what the Universe and even this world would appear through the infinite light of Amitaba Buddha, and what the world would gradually become under the powerful influence of the same.

Such are the doctrines of the Idealistic Buddhism, which is seemingly antagonistic to the earlier Buddhism. The former is preëminently optimistic, and the latter preëminently pessimistic. The earlier Buddhism explained this world as *it is*, not as it *would be*; while the later Buddhism explained what it would become. The earlier Buddhism taught what we *ought to do*, never what we *would become*. The earlier Buddhism taught the non-ego of all creatures and the continuity of Karma, or deeds; while the later Buddhism taught "unconscious reserve of experience," which elucidates the doctrine of the continuity of Karma. The explanation of *what is*, when compared to the explanation of *what would be*, is, if our life is an ascending scale, assuredly pessimistic. On the contrary, *what we would become*, when compared to what we ought to do, is certainly optimistic. The causal nexus is, from the point of view of *what is*, a tyrannical rule; while, on the contrary, the same is, from the point of view of *what would be*, the most important ladder for our ascent. Thus the pessimistic teaching of Hinayana and the optimistic teaching of Mahayana are complementary—they are the two faces of Buddhism. Buddha himself delivered several optimistic discourses. In speaking about his doctrine he said:

"Therefore, O brethren,—ye to whom the truths which I have perceived have been made known by me,—having thoroughly made yourselves master of them, practise them, meditate upon them, and spread them abroad—in order that pure religion may last long and be perpetuated; in order that it may continue to be for the good and happiness of the great multitudes, out of pity for the world, to the good and the gain and the weal of gods and men."

In speaking about the monastic order, Buddha said:

"Uprightness is his [a monk's] delight, and he sees danger

in the least of those things he should avoid; he adopts and trains himself in precepts; he encompasses himself with holiness in word and deed; he sustains his life by means that are quite pure; good is his conduct, guarded the door of his senses; mindful and self-possessed, he is altogether happy!"

Many European scholars erroneously criticize Buddhism as a nihilistic doctrine. Buddha has, however, never taught Nirvana as a total annihilation. Sir Edwin Arnold rightly sings in his charming verses:

"Seeking nothing he gains all;
Foregoing self, the Universe grows 'I';
If any teach Nirvana is to cease,
Say unto such they lie.

Enter the path! There spring the healing streams
Quenching all thirst! There bloom the immortal flowers
Carpeting all the way with joy! There throng
Swiftest and sweetest hours!"

By the "Path," Buddha means: (1) right views, (2) right aspiration, (3) right speech, (4) right conduct, (5) right livelihood, (6) right effort, (7) right mindfulness, and (8) right contemplation. Such a teaching as this is in every respect harmonious with other religions. Schliemacher, the great Prussian theologian, writes in his "Nature of Religion" the very same thing in different language:

"Would they but attempt to surrender their lives from love to God! Would that they would strive to annihilate their personality and to live in the One and in the All! Whosoever has learned to be more than himself knows that he loses little when he loses himself. Only the man who denies himself—sinks himself in as much of the whole Universe as he can attain—and in whose soul a greater and holier longing has arisen has a right to the hope that death gives. This means, in short, union of man with God. This also means what Buddhists fondly say: 'Dew-drops slip into the shining sea.'"

KEIJIRO NAKAMURA.

Yokohama, Japan.

II. BUDDHISM AS I HAVE SEEN IT.

WHEN I first arrived in Japan, I took up my residence in a city some distance from European or American residents. Hardly a hundred yards away, across a narrow ravine, stood a Buddhist temple surrounded by pine trees. At evening, when the wind was whispering in the pines, the mellow tones of the temple bell and the droning chants and litanies of the priests floated in at my study window. The strange surroundings, the quiet evening, the cadences of bell and song lent a peculiar fascination to the scene; and one could almost imagine himself transported to another world, or a witness of strange events in medieval ages.

My first glimpse of Buddhism under these conditions presents an aspect of this religion that explains in part the peculiar charm it has for some minds. Until one has had a still closer view, he readily understands how, at the start, Buddhism appeals even to some who have Christian training. For clearly this religion of Gautama has elements of power; and its mystical aspects, theoretical and superficial, impress both the scholastic and the unlearned.

Japan is perhaps the home of the highest type of Buddhism of the present day. The artistic temperament of the Japanese has modified its original forms, and the cleanliness and enterprise of the people have given the best setting to a religion elsewhere often practically effete. Here, in the Land of the Rising Sun, theoretical Buddhism has come as near realization as anywhere in the world. Not a few, in the quiet of their studies, far away from Buddhism as it actually is, have queried if after all the religion of the Eastern sage has not elements of superiority to the religion of Christ. Viewed superficially, from afar or close at hand, Buddhism is impressive. The hasty traveler, visiting the beautiful temples at Nara or Nikko, in their bright red setting against the evergreen of towering criptomeria, comes away moved by the spectacle. The monuments of Buddhism are intended to impress. It knows how so to use the artistic as to cast its spell over men. It searches out for its

temples some beautiful mountain retreat, where on an eminence, shaded by great trees and protected by sheltering rocks, it rears its houses of worship. It has indeed its shrines and temples, both small and great, in the crowded cities; but its most beautiful structures are in some sylvan solitude, where Nature in her most attractive forms lends herself to the spectacular appeal to man's religious nature. Its temple-areas, even within bustling cities, are, by contrast to the hurly-burly of the street, an invitation to rest and meditation. We cannot question that Buddhism seeks to reach toiling, weary men by the attractions of outward placidity—peaceful surroundings.

Then, too, the observer is struck with much that is calculated to inspire awe in its ritualism and external forms of worship. It has splendid services, and knows full well the value of regalia in the conquest of humanity. If its philosophy theoretically studied charms some minds, others are appealed to by its stately processions and liturgical displays. At times and in certain places it revels in spectacular effects. It is no wonder that a man, standing for the first time in a Buddhist temple to witness some liturgical service, should be impressed with the tones of its great booming bell, the soft antiphonal chants, the odor of incense, and all the witchery of a grand pageantry. Indeed, Buddhism vies with the Greek and Roman Catholics in the use of the very forms and symbols of medieval Christianity. Monasteries and nunneries are the institutions of Buddhism. Celibacy, fastings, retreats, pilgrimages, mendicant vows—all are enjoined and practised. The whole hierarchical system finds its representatives here. Archbishops and abbots, priests, neophytes, and acolytes belong to this system. As one enters almost any large temple in Japan, one cannot fail to be impressed with the remarkable resemblance to Christian symbolism. The altar with its lights, pictures, and images, the use of the censer with the five chains, the cross, the miter, the dalmatic, the rosary—all remind one of what may be seen in any church in Rome.

But these impressions, favorable as they may be, are surface impressions. A closer view of Buddhism is necessary before

we can pass judgment upon it. The Christian scholar who knows his Buddhism from books only may well season his admiration for a while—till he can have knowledge of it in the actual life of its adherents. The hasty tourist may well linger a little longer before he declares the Christian missionary superfluous. The infatuation of superficial knowledge ought to be tried by a more thoroughgoing test. What about Buddhism as a *practical* religion? What about the great test, "By their fruits ye shall know them"? What is Buddhism in its effects?

During a six-years residence in Japan, it has been my privilege to study Buddhism at close range, not only in its superficial aspects but in the application of its doctrines to life. A personal acquaintance with many Buddhists, scholars and priests as well as common believers of both sexes and of all classes, has furnished some data to build upon. And while one would be rash to deny the beneficial effects of this religion in certain directions, he would be dull indeed if his eyes were not open to the falsity of many claims and the pernicious effect of many Buddhist practises.

The central idea of Buddhism, that life is essentially evil, may be easily traced in the spirit and temper of the people. The centuries have left the impress of this doctrine on the lowest peasant as well as on the noble scions who claim descent from the gods. An apathy as regards life, a crushing fatalism, easily distinguishes the Oriental mind. Often in Japan the people suffer from earthquakes, tidal waves, typhoons, fires, and famines; and at first one wonders at the quiet way in which they accept their losses. But a careful study generally reveals a resignation as hopeless as it is pitiful. It is the difference between faith in divine Providence and in relentless fate. As one mingles with the people and comes to know something of the language, he constantly hears the expression, "*Shi kata ganai*" (It can't be helped), which is used under all circumstances. This simple phrase indeed sums up their life's philosophy. When I went once to visit a Japanese neighbor who had a sick child, I found the mother in great distress. Her care and anxiety as she hung over her child knew no bounds—until the

physician informed her that the child's life could not be saved. Then she suddenly became calm and seemingly resigned. All she said was "*Shi kata ga nai*," and thenceforth gave no expression to her grief. Those who have seen the practical effect of a fatalistic philosophy know that her resignation was more pitiful than her tears. Too often, in the stress of life, a seeming resignation is the stolid apathy of confirmed pessimism as cruel as fate—as vaguely comfortless as Nirvana.

Much has been claimed by Buddhists for the kindness to dumb creatures which a belief in the transmigration of souls has fostered. The lowest animals and even insects must be protected, since they "may embody the souls of ancestors." The prohibition of a flesh diet through the centuries bears witness to the beneficence of this doctrine. I am not disposed to deny any facts that will go to substantiate such a claim, but any superiority of Buddhism over Christianity should rest upon an appeal to the truth verified in practical experience. The convincing facts do not appear, at least in Japan. I have visited at one time or another many sections of the country, both north and south, but I have failed to detect this boasted humane sentiment that leaves no need of a society for the prevention of cruelty to animals. On the contrary, an hour's observation in any city of the empire will discover conditions that leave much to be desired; and too often in this land of soul-transmigrations one needs to have his heart steeled against any sentiment with regard to animal suffering.

If you order a fresh fowl for dinner your order will be promptly filled. While you wait the jagged knife is applied to the throat of the unfortunate bird, and before he has ceased bleeding, or life is fairly extinct, he is plucked and in your hand. The canine family has a large representation in Japan, as in most Oriental lands. And when dogs become too numerous the Government hires men with long poles to engage in the business of extermination. The animals are now and again killed at a single blow, but quite as often are only maimed—to drag themselves into some sheltered place and die by inches. The only protest that I have ever known against such crass bru-

tality has come from Christian, not Buddhist, journals. I have frequently seen a horse fettered by its master, with head tied close to the ground, or an ox hitched with its head drawn up by the ring in its nose, to suffer for hours in that position. Over and over again I have had to refuse a saddle-horse because a galled back, shamelessly uncared for, rendered him useless. Perhaps it is not too much to say that half of the horses used as beasts of burden in Japan could not pass through Boston or New York without the instant arrest of their drivers by the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. Certainly Christians have nothing to boast of regarding their humane treatment of dumb beasts; but they do not need to go to Buddhists to learn how to improve.

Then, again, the position Buddhism assigns to *woman* is sadly against it. Both in theory and practise Buddhism degrades womanhood. Little more could be expected of a system whose founder, Gautama, deserted his wife and child that he might pursue his "enlightened way." And one who is familiar with his followers to-day, with their complacent air of superiority to the gentler sex, will quickly agree that the disciples are worthy of their master. When a husband and wife are seen on the street together in Japan the wife always walks some steps behind her lord. If they ride in a jinrikisha, the man ascends first and leaves the woman to climb in after him. If they attend a party the man precedes his wife to the banquet hall, and "my lord" is served to viands first. If company arrive at the home the wife retires, or appears merely to serve. Buddhism is careful that women shall not forget their true "sphere."

A common theme for a sermon is "the duty of woman." Such sentiments as the following, from the celebrated moralist, Kairaba, on "The Greater Learning of Woman," are the basis of most exhortations to the fair sex:

"From her earliest youth a girl should observe the line of demarcation separating women from men. . . . The great, lifelong duty of woman is obedience. . . . She must look to her husband as her lord, and must serve him with all worship and reverence. . . . Let her never even dream of anger. If

her husband is dissolute she must expostulate with him, but never nurse or vent her anger. She must not selfishly think first of her own parents and only secondly of her husband's relations. . . . After marriage her chief duty is to honor her father-in-law and mother-in-law—to honor them beyond her own father and mother. . . . On every point must she inquire of her father-in-law and mother-in-law, and abandon herself to their direction: Even if thy father-in-law and mother-in-law be pleased to hate and vilify thee, be not angry with them, and murmur not. . . . The ancients on the birth of a female child let it lie on the floor for three days. Even in this may be seen the likening of the man to heaven and of the woman to earth."

Indeed, the whole institution of marriage, as practised in Japan, is a sad commentary on the influence of Buddhism. No priest is present at the marriage feast. No ceremony worthy of the name marks the entrance upon this relation. A cup of saké, or rice wine, is passed between the contracting parties. Without words and without vows, marriage assumes under the Buddhist system little sacredness; and it gives us no surprise to learn from statistics that one out of every three marriages ends in divorce. This is what we might expect when we remember that, according to the teaching of the sage, a man may divorce his wife for any of seven reasons: (1) Disobedience to her parents-in-law, (2) barrenness, (3) lewdness, (4) jealousy, (5) leprosy, (6) overmuch talking and prattling, (7) stealing. Any one of these is sufficient cause for a man to put away his wife; but the wife may not exercise a like privilege. The husband may be guilty of any of these and of many more, but the duty of the wife is still clear: She must be docile, obedient, and submissive to the end.

So thoroughly are these ideas planted in the Japanese mind that Christian converts find it difficult to believe or practise the Christian part. One of the graduates of a Christian theological school where I taught for several years, desirous of contracting marriage, when presented by the "middleman" (according to Japanese custom) with a Christian girl as a suitable life companion, objected to a union with her on the ground that she combed her hair after the manner of European women. The

real truth was, he feared that Christian ideas and education would render her less tractable and submissive.

When we come to apply the practical test with regard to moral conditions under Buddhism, we touch the most serious of its many defects. The idea of *chastity*, for instance, in its Christian conception, is unknown in Japan. The word itself is not found in the Japanese vocabulary, and the social conditions that obtain are often appalling. To say nothing of large sections of every great city set apart by the government for immoral purposes,—the houses of assignation often forming cities in themselves,—customs prevail that from a Christian standpoint are almost beyond belief. Among the lower classes parents not infrequently sell their young daughters into lives of shame. From a Japanese standpoint the horror of so unnatural a crime is mitigated in view of a public sentiment that makes unchastity itself commendable under certain conditions. The daughter who, to support parents in financial distress, enters a *yoshiwara* (licensed brothel) for a series of years is regarded as most filial and heroic. A clean heart and an unsullied name are not such priceless jewels as under the Christian system. When it is remembered that the present Emperor is an illegitimate son and the imperial prince the son of one of his twelve concubines, we can readily understand the estimate that attaches to purity.

Shall we, however, blame Buddhism for this condition? It might indeed be claimed that such conditions prevail *in spite of* Buddhism, were it not that Buddhism itself is notoriously corrupt. The charge that the whole system is honeycombed with corruption is made by such celebrated moralists as Fukizawa and many even within the pale of the system itself. He is blind indeed who cannot see abundant evidence of the deplorable influence of Buddhism on morality.

It is commonly noted that, wherever Buddhist temples are grouped and a numerous priesthood sustained, adjacent stands the *yoshiwara*. Indeed, the presence of Buddhist shrines within the precincts of such houses is a well-known fact.

A hierarchical system that has so besmirched the common

mind that mothers deem it an honor to relinquish their daughters to a profligate archbishop—a system that has forfeited the confidence of the people in the purity of the priesthood from the highest prelate to the lowest priestly neophyte—will find it difficult to clear itself from the charge that immorality and Buddhism are closely connected. A religion that has long been hand-in-hand with vice, that has indulged in degrading forms of Phallicism, that blushes not at unspeakable practises, can never claim immunity from severe criticism, even though it may still cast its spell over some minds.

(Rev.) CLARENCE EDGAR RICE.

Reading, Pa.

A CONVERSATION

WITH

RABBI CHARLES FLEISCHER,*

ON

EDUCATION AND DEMOCRACY.

Q. Rabbi Fleischer, as one of the representative thinkers and religious leaders of New England, and as a man devoted to the best interests of our schools and republican institutions, I desire to obtain for our readers your views on popular education and democracy—on the hopes and the perils of the present. For to-day it seems to me that there is an alarming lethargy among our thought-molders touching basic principles upon which free institutions depend—a falling away from those high ideals cherished by the noble statesmen of earlier days concerning the duty of the citizen and the high mission of

*BIOGRAPHIC NOTE.—Rabbi Charles Fleischer was born in Germany. When between eight and nine years of age, however, his parents came to New York. Here the boy went through the public schools and later entered the College of the City of New York. His university education and special theological training were completed in Cincinnati, Ohio, after which he spent some time with the eminent Rabbis Krauskopf and Berkowitz, of Philadelphia, where he remained until called to take charge of the Temple Adath Israel of Boston, as successor of Rabbi Solomon Schindler, so well known to the readers of THE ARENA. Here he almost immediately took a prominent place among the foremost pulpit orators and thinkers of Boston. He possesses the thoughtful qualities so characteristic of the German mind, happily blended with a brilliancy frequently found among the more southern peoples. He is a fluent speaker, a broad-visioned scholar, and a passionate lover of justice and human rights,—one of the noblest among the ministers of our modern Athens,—a fine type of what a religious leader should be and a man for the hour, because civilization never more urgently demanded leaders who are first of all apostles of justice and humanity than at the present time; and one of the most hopeful signs of the present is found in the fact that young scholars like Rabbi Fleischer are coming to the front and taking up the work once so gloriously carried forward by Lowell, Channing, Parker, Emerson, Whittier, and Phillips.—B. O. F.

our great Republic. Do you not believe that a comprehensive outline of the underlying principles of democracy, or free and popular government, should be taught in a positive way in our State-endowed public schools?

A. You have put your finger, as it seems to me, upon what ought to be the most serviceable means for the making of our democracy and for the rearing of the type of American that will be worthy of the honor of claiming kinship with Jefferson and Lincoln and all the other saints and heroes of our young Republic. The State-endowed public schools ought to assure to our country State-devoted children and citizens. In Greece there was a definite relation between the training of a child and the later participation in the affairs of the nation—most of which, with us in America, is left to chance or to that kind Providence which is supposed to guard children and—infant republics. It would seem to be a matter of course that, after we have decided what we want America to be (and we shall choose for ourselves no grander career than that upon which the revolutionary fathers launched us), it would appear to be self-evident that nothing could so well serve our efforts toward this end as our public schools.

The first purpose of our school system should be to “educate” our boys and girls; *i. e.*, to draw forth, to bring out, to develop what is in them, to cultivate the “seed perfection” which nestles in them, to awaken them to self-consciousness, to start into activity the life-long growing pains, to rouse reverence, dignity, self-respect,—in a word, to make physically, mentally, morally, spiritually healthy young men and women out of them, as far as that may lie within the power of this single agency, the public school.

The second purpose of our public schools might be the making of Americans, by the influencing of the child-mind with an appreciation of and zeal for democracy and a particular enthusiasm for the experiment in democracy upon which our American people is engaged. I would have the seers of humanitarianism, the prophets of democracy, the preachers of and workers for world-wide fraternity, become familiar figures to

the minds of our children. I would have men like Washington, Samuel Adams, Jefferson, Lincoln, and John Brown (these are not the physical fighters, but the spiritual soldiers of our American democracy)—I would have these placed literally in an American calendar of saints; men to be reverenced by our future Americans as the apostles of our Republic. I would have a graded system, from the kindergarten through high school and college, of instruction in the fundamental principles of universal democracy and in all the complicated structure of our own national, State, and city governments. Yes, the public schools ought to make—again as far as this single agency can—intelligent, enthusiastic, consecrated young democratic Americans.

Thirdly, our schools ought to provide, as far as this may be made possible (and we have thus far made scarcely a frank confession of our duty in this regard)—our schools ought to provide our children with the powers of self-help. The schools should enable our boys and girls to become self-supporting young men and women. This is no question of classes and masses (it is time we got beyond the notion that democracy is a scheme for the exaltation of the weak and the poor), but of the right which each individual in a democracy ideally has upon the State (which is simply the organized individualism of the millions) to “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness;” to bread, bed, and clothing; to the fullest opportunity for self-development.

The fourth purpose of our public schools should be—and I have stated these in the order of my estimation of these purposes: to give to its pupils knowledge both for the ends already enumerated and for its own sake and for the steady growth of culture and for intellectual wealth and stimulus. Perhaps I have anticipated in my rather full answer to your searching question some other queries with which your “glittering eye” seems charged.

Q. Do you not believe that, while carefully avoiding instilling any religious dogmas, the great eternal ethical verities upon which all well-ordered minds are agreed—and which in-

clude justice, the rights of the individual, and his obligations to society and the State, integrity of thought and action, and human brotherhood—should receive far more attention from our educators than is given them at the present time?

A. After what I have stated to be, in my opinion, the chief business of the schools, namely, to make men and women, there is for me no alternative but an eager "yes" in answer to your question. If we had more faith, we would have less fear to face this problem. If our churches did not deem self-perpetuation their first concern, they would not dread the possible effects of moral instruction in our public schools. If, I say, we had a genuine faith in the essential religiousness of human nature—in man as the unfailing fount of spirituality, and in human relations as the inexhaustible stuff for a progressive ethical idealism—we would not fear to make our schools the direct means for building a finer manhood upon this basis. As it is, a golden opportunity for giving a powerful push forward to the race, for founding our democracy upon the rock of righteousness, is wasted. I am not blind to the fact that even the present school curriculum has its ethical bearings ($1+1=2$ also means that cause+cause=effect; Rome and rottenness meant, and always will mean, decline and fall, etc.); but I have never met a stronger reason for keeping ethics out of our schools than this one: that it is the function of the Church and not of the public school to impart spiritual and moral instruction. And such a reason is a weak enough one, for many reasons:

The churches reach half or less of the children of the United States. Even this proportion of the children is under the direct influence of the respective churches only an hour or less each week. It is the very exceptional church that spends as much as half of its weekly hour with the children in direct moral instruction, most of the time being taken in teaching dogmas, diluted theology, religious history, and in moral pap which is nauseating and repellent to the average healthy child. The schools, on the other hand, reach practically all the children of the land five days in a week, and could give the boys as

thorough a course in the fundamentals and details of the ethical life as a growing sense of the importance, indeed of the necessity, of such a course may dictate. At present the development of the moral sense is left largely to haphazard or to parents who are, in the main, untrained and very often even unfit to render such social service. If it is desirable that the State should teach all children to read and write, why is it not much more the duty of the State not only to awaken and to stimulate their sense of right and wrong, but also to win their early reverence for the everlasting moral truths and their intelligent understanding of and their glad obedience to the basic ethical ideals?

There can be no reasonable objection to such a departure other than that wise teachers and other efficient means for the enterprise may not now be ready. But these will come with the existence and proclamation of a demand for their service. We are past the possibility of a reunion between Church and State. No one who dreads such a possibility needs indulge his fears because of a prospect of inculcating moral principles in State-endowed schools. Our national loyalty to the ideal of religious liberty would prevent the use of the schools for theological propaganda. I hold that, as long as a single atheist or agnostic exists (and probably there will always be large numbers of both), and while theological differences continue (I cannot imagine their coming to an end)—I hold that our public schools must rigidly avoid theological teachings or sectarian beliefs, by however large and overwhelming majorities such theology and belief may be cherished.

But concerning the primary moral principles there is now no difference of opinion among enlightened and pure-motived persons, however men may differ in the application of these principles under specific circumstances. Reverence for truth, passion for justice, respect for the human individual, devotion to human welfare, consecration to the State, love for all men, fervent regard for honor and honesty,—these and similar basic ideals have won the practically unanimous suffrages of men. If they have such lofty place in human regard, why not use

the means at our command for winning the intelligent and zealous acceptance of them by those who are to be the makers of the America of our aspiration: the nation exalted by righteousness? Every consideration of national self-preservation and the desire that our democracy do its utmost for the citizens would seem to prompt the use of our schools toward the end of rearing our children to be the eager servants of righteousness. No future poet will then ever need to pray God to give us *men*.

Q. Is it not to a great extent true that the apparent absence or lack of a strong and steadfast civic conscience in our municipal, State, and national life is largely due to the failure of our educational system to awaken the moral sensibilities while training the intellect, and to impress the principles of democracy and the obligations of the individual to the State upon the child mind?

A. It is inspiring testimony to the natural moral strength and the native wisdom of the average human being, in our present stage of human evolution, that so much goodness and sound sense manifest themselves in our public servants and in our general national conduct, when we consider the fact that we have not been directly trained for self-government and for active participation in the business of a democracy. The "strong and steadfast civic conscience" of which you speak is a consummation devoutly to be wished and worked for. A democracy differs somewhat from a poet in that it is not only born but made. America is in the making. There is no good excuse for pessimism regarding our "civic conscience." We have never had one. We are just about to develop one. But first we must grow a civic sense. Civic conscience will grow out of that. We are not a nation yet, but only the beginnings—the collected material for a nation. Democracy does not spring full-grown from the head of a cosmic Jove. The American "nation" was not at once made when it was born of the idea that all men had a right to themselves. A century and more we have been in the making. The millions who have come hither from the ends of the earth need to be converted to the

religion of democracy before the unifying force of this faith shall make of us a single and self-conscious people. From this sense of unity will spring, after tedious processes, after many gropings and stumbling and fallings, national self-consciousness, civic sense, and civic conscience. Patience, patience, and intelligent consecration!

Let us beware of falling into the traditional attitude toward the past: of imagining, as other peoples have done, that back of us lies the Golden Age and we of the modern day are degenerate and false to the faith of the fathers. This is the best day that ever was, and to-morrow will be better—if we take care to make it so. Back of us are the Sodoms, and looking that way, like Lot's wife, is to court petrifaction. One is not too happy an optimist who believes that, even in our growing nation to-day, with all its many millions new to the idea, there is a wider general appreciation of democracy than there was at the time of the declaration of independence of the mother country.

You will remember that Browning has one of his characters say: “*A nation is but the attempt of many
To rise to the completer life of one.*”

So I do not despair of our people. We of America need many generations to rise to the completer sense of democracy of a Jefferson, a John Brown, or a Lincoln. But we shall reach it—if we try. We are now in childhood's stage as a people. Indeed, our civil war and our Spanish “war” may be regarded as infantile colic and measles. We are now going through kindergarten experience. We are just approaching the beginning of self-consciousness. Now a new enthusiasm is awakening among us: an intelligent consecration to the religion of democracy. Increasingly our individual and collective activity in all its various phases will be the evidence of that spirit within us, even as practical morality is ever the best proof of religiousness. But this tendency needs careful nurture. The good growth, the natural progress of the human spirit, can be accelerated—and, as I think, through no means so readily as through our public-school system.

If America has advanced thus far on the impulse given her by the revolutionary fathers and the innate tendency of men to aspire and to progress, what may not America become when we are a democracy of priests—a people reared in and devoted to the new Western religion, which shall in time make peaceful conquest of all humanity? Of course, I mean the religion of democracy, the faith in the immeasurable value of every human being. No, I did not misunderstand your question, but purposely used it as a point of departure—as ministers frequently use their text—to correct what seems to me an inexcusably desperate feeling about the status of democracy in America. Let me repeat: the American nation not yet is, but is becoming; civic consciousness and civic conscience are in the dawning; democracy was born in the primitive instinct of self-preservation, and our American democracy is still and will ever be in the making. Toward this end our children should be trained in the law of democracy, which harmonizes individual right and social duty: "from each according to his power, to each according to his need." This is the law; the rest is only commentary. Let us go, and learn, and do!

Q. What, in your judgment, are the chief perils confronting our government to-day?

A. In answering this question let me risk seeming paradoxical. I have just inveighed against a pessimism common to many of our most intellectual men and women who are eager that no harm shall come to our Republic. Their Jeremiads against a faithlessness which cannot well exist in a people that is only slowly rising to faith in what are to be our national ideals—their wailings, I want to say, are discouraging to would-be Americans, as I believe the long-standing belief in the "fall of man" tended to discourage men from trying to rise. This pessimism, then, toward our struggling democracy I believe to be one of our perils. Another and a greater danger is our national optimism—the general feeling that the King (America) can do no wrong, or, if he does, that no penalty is to be paid therefor; that we are young and can afford to make mistakes; that we are rich and can afford to scatter

wealth; that we are strong and can afford to waste strength; that we are favored of the gods; in brief, that we are exempt from the operation of the law of cause and effect. This national blind optimism has led us lately to accept the doctrine of "manifest destiny," bartering therefor a more self-respecting belief in national moral responsibility. This is a serious danger. We must check a tendency to recklessness and irresponsibility, characteristic of youth, and, therefore, natural enough in our youthful Republic. But we would better learn that national dignity and the aspiration to lead the world forbid indulgence in youthful folly or the adoption of a superstitious fatalism, which wisdom has long since discarded, that such indulgence is not consonant with adult democracy and moral world-leadership.

Fortunately, these two tendencies are mutually corrective, and the backward-looking pessimist and the blind optimist both assist the onward march guided by the loyal, faithful, forward-looking idealist. I do not believe that the success of *our* experiment in democracy is inevitable, but I have faith that wisdom and counsel will assure our progress toward the triumph. Other perils confront us: bosses, who rule us because they *can* rule us and we cannot yet govern ourselves; trusts (perhaps good in principle, but vicious in practise), sapping commercial and industrial vitality, monopolizing because they can, and we as yet cannot help it; protective tariff laws, making for national isolation, international antagonism, and unnatural and unjust commercial conditions; efforts at restricting immigration, unbrotherly, fundamentally false to democracy, which is not an American but a universal principle;—these are some of the perils that exist. Let me say, rather, they are eloquent evidence of the work before us before we have traveled an appreciable distance toward the ideals of democracy which so many millions fondly imagine we have already reached, even as others wrongly believe we have steadily receded from them. As a double corrective, I would suggest a deep study of the philosophy of history, to the end that we may recognize the operation of the law of causation in national affairs; and,

secondly, a constant comparison and testing of our national policies and conduct with and by the accepted and professed national principles of democracy.

Q. Is it not true that a free government soon loses its proud preëminence as a leader of civilization and progress, and becomes in fact if not in name and theory a despotism, whenever the opinion-forming influences cease their vigilant agitation against all selfish influences that are subversive in character and which seek to foster and advance class interests at the expense of the interests of all the people?

A. Your question is so comprehensively stated as fairly to answer itself, if one happens to sympathize, as I do, with the spirit that informs it. Surely we have the right, in a republic that aims toward democracy, to demand that nothing short of the welfare of the entire people shall be the concern of our public servants—our legislators. So far as tariffs and subsidies can have any excuse for existence among us, they should stand the test-question: are they for the good of all, or for the benefit of a few? With every enactment of class legislation, whether the beneficiaries be few or many, rich or poor, our Ship of State lurches toward oligarchy and despotism and away from democracy. All such legislation is immoral and vicious in itself and retards democracy's day of triumph. I want to expand here what I said in answer to one of your former questions, that democracy is no scheme for giving fictitious strength to the weak because they are many, nor for making rich the poor, nor for deifying the mass of men. Democracy is to be no respecter of persons—the Bible has taught us the correct attitude, as it happens: "Thou shalt not respect the person of the poor, nor honor the person of the great: in righteousness shalt thou judge thy neighbor." Democracy is to do justice to all men and to every man. It is not to deify the mass, to fear and to placate mobs, but to dignify the mass and to regard mobs as collections of individuals, each of whom singly is entitled to his rights. In democracy there are no "classes" in the snobbish sense, only precious individuals having dignity and rights, and owing duty and responsibility to the State—the organized ma-

jesty. One way of providing generally for all is by giving much to a few at a time, so finally to all; another way is by giving a little at a time to all, and thus gradually everything to all. The former is the common method of class legislation; the latter alone is democratic. Indeed, we may go a step further than your question suggests—a nation that means to realize democracy must increasingly take into consideration, when it acts and legislates as a nation, not only the interests of its own people but the interests of other peoples. That at least is the ideal, however far from that we may allow "practical" considerations to keep us. If the seed of democracy is the selfish instinct of self-preservation, the proof of its growth is in the expanding social spiral gradually enfolding all humankind. As you say, then, "opinion-forming influences should never cease their vigilant agitation toward this end."

Q. In our present Philippine policy have we not departed from those great basic truths upon which our government was founded and which for a century gave our Republic a unique and enviable place as leader of the liberal nations of earth?

A. I do not believe that we mean to, nor shall, adhere to our present Philippine policy. When we recognize the fact that adherence to the policy threatens the realization of democracy, we shall manfully find a way out of the scrape. Meanwhile, even as it was desirable in Lincoln's time to convince the people that the Union could not exist half slave and half free, so it is certainly necessary to assure and convince people to-day that our democracy cannot remain uninitiated when we assume autocratic, despotic control over others. If democracy is true here, it is true in the Philippines. You may as well attempt to limit the application of the law of gravitation by despotic fiat. A well-meaning but faith-lacking minister of the gospel told me the other day that democracy is well enough for us, but is not to be applied to people unfit for it. And, pray, who is to judge the fitness of a people for self-government? How dare *we* judge? Where is it written in the heavens that every people must at once have the sort of government that fits and pleases us? If Filipinos are not "fit" for self-rule in democratic

fashion, there would seem to be no good reason why they may not still be independent of us and be ruled by a despot, or a "divine-right" monarch, or a constitutional king, after the manner of Russia, Germany, or England. The Filipinos are as much entitled as the Slavonic, Teutonic, or Anglo-Saxon race to grow up after their own manner and through their own evolution (the only possible way); they are equally entitled, I say, to take 500 or 1,000 years to develop toward democracy, without our autocratic "benevolent" interference.

As for us, we would better remember that we have a sufficient task before us in making true of ourselves even Lincoln's unsatisfactory definition of democracy, as "government of the people, by the people, for the people." Even then we shall be only at the beginning of the development and application of the democratic ideal. For democracy is more than a mere form of government—more than a political policy. Democracy is potentially a universal spiritual principle—aye, a religion. Conceived largely, democracy transcends New Zealands and Switzerlands and Americas, or as applied to these is an ethical ideal seeking political embodiment and expression. We of America are privileged to become, if we will, the "peculiar people" consecrated to that ideal. Not America will preserve democracy; but democracy will—if we become glad slaves of that idea—preserve and greater and glorify America.

The triumph of democracy is as inevitable as human progress, and that triumph will come either through us or in spite of us. The question we should now put to ourselves as a people is: Shall we accept or refuse the proffered glory? Refusing it, we shall nevertheless continue, for a century or two, to grow in physical might and material prosperity, but shall as inevitably thereafter enter upon the period of our decline and fall as did ancient Rome and modern England. But if—as I believe—we shall accept religiously the "mission" that looms before us, we shall not only become equally strong and prosperous, but we shall grow to be the greatest of world-powers, naturally and easily winning the nations to our "faith," through the compelling influence of our embodied idealism.

THE PLACE OF EDUCATION IN REFORM.

IN one who feels himself compelled to do sentry duty for that vast army which marches where it listeth, protesting is a common mood. Many times must he sniff danger while they sleep. Often it only seems to rise before his too anxious eyes; and to report it would be folly—a folly that many men commit. But sometimes it comes great, menacing, and awful, and one must call out the guard and make report to those who plot and plan for the common weal; for it will not down. There is that in our commonly accepted attitude toward education—its value and its objects—which menaces and which is unworthy of us; that which is out of joint with the rest of our knowledge, which for our common good must be recast.

The last year has been full of criticisms of education coming from persons of many occupations and with varying claims upon our attention. The great business man has again come forward to say that the education of the schools unfits for compliance with the demands of business, and the teacher claps his hands in glee; for to set at naught the finality of some of the rules of business is an end that he desired. The reformer has not been slow to declare that his child, who is, like Samuel, destined from his cradle to serve a chosen deity of reform, shall not fellow with priests of any other Egypt. The churchman has pointed out, as of yore, that the sons of Dr. Faustus are legion, and that they follow the teaching profession—while the novelist who is by far the most ruthless murderer among us has been forced to protest against that shocking spoliation of men which the schools carry on.

The one marked result of all this criticism has been to stir up the complacent college and to demand from it reasons for being, which in many cases it has been unable to give. That the college is a thing in itself, few would admit; but its very isolation has tended to breed within it a sense of divine right—just as habitual unapproachableness brought the ancient king nearer

to God than to men ; and, when taken to task by an unusually daring revolutionary, the college, like the king, finds it easier to prate about an instituted truth, as if the bare assertion were the guaranty of its possession. No greater service can be at any time rendered than is involved in the destruction of its idols of the cave. Current discussion has marred the faces of many of them. The traditions of a barren classicism have given place to a sense of the vitality of the humanities, but the newer traditions of formal science hold their followers like a spell. Out of all this attacking and retreating—out of the charging and countercharging of those who fight with words and those who fight with deeds—we are learning much of man's life and of genuine education : the way to help that life on.

The enemies of education are of two kinds: those who discredit it by relying too little upon it as it must be, and those who rely too much upon it as it now is. To the first class belong the reformers: those who insist upon short cuts in the remaking of the world; who believe in the legislation of force, in revolutions, in cataclysms, and great catastrophic changes. The very word *reform* seems to have been made to designate just such processes as these, for the shorter word *forming* will cover every influence of orderly making. But the reformer may, with justice, object that his effort is not to forsake but to hasten the orderly process of development; yet he cannot maintain that he succeeds in seeing that process whole. In fact, in most cases, he will confess that he does not even try to see it thus, so interested is he in seeing it partial.

When a congress of settlement workers fulminates that poverty of purse is the cause of the wretchedness that its members seek to alleviate, it not only shows supernatural skill in singling its differences, but it also exhibits something less than a rational interest in the natural process of growth. When the various anti-saloon organizations meet in convention and assign causes and remedies they are hardly more fortunate. When the socialist pictures his coming Eden, it is a peace that shall come, not naturally, but by special enactment. He may indeed maintain that it will come through education ; but he does not mean what

we mean by *education*, and what he means is too abstract to be genuine. When the anarchist declares that the presence, not the absence, of law is responsible for the ills of men, he does not propose to advance by considering all the causes, but by abstracting one.

What, then, is the esteem in which the *reformer* holds education? All reforms advance by propaganda; all reforms employ a teaching process, and all reforms exist to rectify the errors of the schools—to amend, to revise, to supersede the work of the teacher. There is no organized lay body that exists solely to insist upon the necessity of his method and to lend him countenance and support. One who is familiar with men and women who give their lives to these various forms of reformatory effort cannot fail to be shocked—not that they insist that their pet forms of cure will help to cure, but that they tend to insist that they alone will cure. Instead of working *with* the school and lending it all the encouragement in his power, the reformer tends to discredit it. No one would maintain that the school is the only agency that can bring about that remaking of human experience which will abolish want, secure justice, and spread peace; but he can insist that the principle for which the school stands is the only principle that can secure this end.

Normal want is due to one of two causes—lack of salable ability or absence of due return. Nothing but education can transform muscular or mental energy into salable skill. On the other hand, what will insure a due return? What will prevent the grinding of the faces of the competent poor? The reconstruction of our ideas with regard to justice and duty—that and nothing short of it. Reformers are declaring that men must be changed as to their pocketbooks; that what is in the pockets of the rich must be put into the pockets of the poor—and then laws must be made to keep it there. But this is the peace of the policeman, and the relief is very much like station-house relief. The workman is not more skilled; the employer is not more trustworthy; the real situation is not changed. The king has come and rules by force and fear—while cheating and begging and fighting must go on as before.

A man is a body of thoughts and feelings, and if you would change the man you must change his thoughts and feelings. His whole life is a process that works such changes within him. If his wage is changed his thoughts will change. If the laws are changed, it will affect him—thus he will become aware of it. Any reform would seem to meet this requirement. What, then, is the advantage of an educational reform? That it changes his experience in the greatest possible degree and with the least expense of time and energy. One is not greatly benefited by the gift of a single meal, while the same time spent in showing him the use of a tool may make him self-supporting for life. Suppose one were left to rediscover the world, which he uses, through his unaided self. Nothing but the somewhat uncertain factor of heredity prevents one saying that it would take him just as long to make the rediscovery as it took the race to make the first discovery.

The process of education is solely and only our attempt to reconstitute the original impulses and tendencies with which men are born, through the medium of past human experience. But in this process the whole body of impulses that men have must be brought to expression in ways that have been tried and not found wanting. That kind of past experience must be selected which has meant unity of self-expression. That form of experience which divided the man against himself, which set a part of his impulses at war with the rest of them, was not good then and is not good to-day. In other words, that education was good and is good which educates the whole man, not a part of him. The test of true education is in the man, not in society. It were as monstrous to say that that is truth which society decrees as that that is education for any man which society countenances as fitting him to fill the place which society has allotted to him. True, that is not truth which will not commend itself to reason wherever found, and that is not true education which works social harm; but it must always be the best reason, not the consensus, that determines the truth. Just so it must be the highest and not the common intelligence which shall say what education is best. On this score, my objections to the reformer

are twofold. He does not stand for an adequate reform; he is a tinker, not an artisan; he is a quack, not a physician—for he thinks by a slight change to work a momentous transformation. And my second charge is like unto it: that his clattering and his quacking prevent others from whole-hearted attention to this great work—by distracting them, by attempting to alienate their affections, by dividing their interests and their energies.

The process of education is like Aristotle's process of manufacture—fourfold. The stuff of education, the thing to be educated, the material cause, is the given subject with definite impulses and a character already formed. The formal cause, or the plan, comes from past human experience. It is the shape, the character, which his impulses must be brought to take. The efficient cause is the teaching influence—that medium through which past experience speaks, be it teacher or book. The final cause, the end of it all, is the reconstructed man—formed, not by the mechanical process of adding to or subtracting from his bulk, but transformed. And the process is far more difficult than that which the sculptor knows, for he molds by cutting away his material, while here the original material must all be molded by being retained. One cannot disregard a bit of it; he must remake it all or none—for to remake in part only is but to distort that natural beauty which is already there.

Take the stuff of education first. What are the tendencies that belong to the individual? In other words, what is the form he has at birth, which education must develop? A great authority has pointed out that his interests are fourfold: (1) A social interest, which is expressed in communication with others in an infinity of ways; (2) a scientific interest, an inborn curiosity that makes him an inquiring mind through life; (3) a constructive interest, which constitutes him a builder—which enables him to body forth in things that which he discovers in men and events. His fourth division, an artistic interest, seems to me almost superfluous; but art is only a kind of construction, and every man is an artist when society and his own inquiry feed his constructive effort in a sufficient degree.

These are the natural materials that education as a process must transform. Does the school seek to develop them harmoniously? No; no more does our theory of education regard each individual as possessing them. A truly universal education must seek to realize the natural good of each individual, not part of it alone. How shall it do so? The experiences that men have already had either served to unify human impulses or to bring greater discord among them. Such of them as have served to unify are the forms that must be used to bring about such unity to-day, and it belongs to every man to reap a benefit from them. If one inherits his impulses from the years, shall he not have a share in that wealth of experience which was their outcome? Shall he not claim as his right and his due the privilege of receiving them whole, not in part? But the reformer and the educator are both agreed that to educate a man beyond his position in life is to do him a great wrong; that there is a kind of human experience that is not his, and that will paralyze him rather than make him powerful; that there is an education for the peasant, an education for the middle-class man, and an education for the upper-class man—all should go to the grammar school, some to the high school, and a few to the college.

This statement must mean one of two things—either culture is an evil to most men or the high school and the college are trade schools. If man as man cannot benefit by sharing in our common knowledge, it must be that men as men are either differently constituted or should become differently constituted. But the days of the false Platonic psychology are done—a doctrine false as psychology and falsely ascribed to Plato. Society is not made up of a many who are like the beasts (having nothing but a sensuous soul), of a few who have a soul of daring besides, and a select few who are the fortunate possessors of a soul of reason. Although we are far too much inclined to treat men as if these ancient distinctions still obtained, yet no man will dare to say that they do.

The qualities enumerated under the word *human* are universal. They belong to us all, and if we are to bring to perfec-

tion those powers or impulses which are common to men we must educate them as they are. If man is universal the process of bringing him to himself must be a universal process. Individual bits of iron are not all of the same consistency, yet the process of iron working must be applied to every piece that is iron. But some one will reply that my illustration but betrays my case, for there are furnace-men and puddlers and heaters and rollers, just as there are grammar schools and high schools and colleges. Quite true; to get iron of a certain quality and for certain purposes it is sufficient to melt down limestone and ore. To get muck bar, that result must be melted again and rolled. To get iron—finished, marketable iron, which can be used for an infinity of purposes—it must be heated once again and rolled. If education is indeed a process of fitting means to arbitrary and fixed ends—if the aim of education is to make workers, not men—then the pig-iron product will do to make castings: to fill a place where few demands are made upon it save that of keeping its original position. The muck bar product will have a slightly better fiber and can be depended upon for more purposes, since it has a greater tensile strength, while the more finished product will have a much broader range of use. That which we work is but a thing, and the character that we seek to give it is determined by its use, not by its nature. It will serve just so far as it keeps its place, not so far as it thinks and feels.

This is the common theory of education—a kind of iron-molding of men. For this theory, education is filling in, is manufacture, is determined by one's place in the social machine. The laborer must be educated to do his work; nothing more is required. The teacher must be submitted to a somewhat more complex process; while the professional man must, and the business man's son may, be sent to college. My point is that if these schools are not trade schools—and I do not believe they are; if the aim of this process is not to make cogs, but men, and this process can make men more satisfactorily than any other that we know, we must box our compass anew and say that whatever is good in the high school and in the college is

good because it makes men—and is therefore good for every man. And if our words are genuine we will insist upon a universal education as a solvent of that multitude of inconsistencies and oppositions which befoul our common life. If developed impulse is manliness, and if genuine manliness means peace and growth, not unrest and war, and if genuine manliness can be attained by rethinking the thoughts of the great and the good of all time and by reexperiencing their experience, then is reform but another name for education, and the hope of the reformer belongs of right to the teacher alone.

If human impulse is to go on its unaided way, then is all reform unnecessary. But if it would gain time by seeking direction from accumulated experience it must go where this experience is to be had in the richest measure possible. To be a man is something more than to fill a place—something more than a well regulated habit: it is to *create* a somewhat besides. To be a man is something more than to depend: it is to be independent, to be the outer world, to find one's self in it all. To be a man is to have an orderly, consistent, harmonious experience—to be at one with one's self. To attain such a state something more than a trade is necessary. All life is inward. Why not enrich it? The only world for any man is the world he knows. It alone must supply him opportunity; it alone can outlet his energy—can give him interests and enable him to realize himself. If its limits are fixed too narrowly, it becomes a pen and he a caged animal, who goes through life with impulses and instincts that he can by no means express or satisfy. For him civilization has erected problems in the public street. It has built its manifold life into brick and mortar. It has set up laws and constitutions, an organized society and an established State. Its religious feeling it has objectified as a Church. Its reverence and patriotism it has set forth in monuments. Its highways and its seaways, its armies and its fleets—what are all these but challenges to understand that reality of human life of which they are but signs; and who can be at home among them unless he knows their tongue?

The question of education is not how to make a man fit the

demands of the market-place, nor yet how to make him shine in society, but how to make the best of the whole man. And this question attaches to every man. Until it be answered we may erect memorials in the market-place and monuments in the squares; we may fill our public halls and museums with the products of the genius of our own and all other times; we may buy and accumulate and treasure that which is great and good and lovely to behold, and loan it to the public use; we may have open doors and a crier to hail men to our exhibition: but we invest in dross and multiply the joy and beauty of life not at all until we educate the nation to see with its eyes and hear with its ears the glory in which it dwells and the greatness it inherits. All other forms of effort will but abandon men to their side eddies. Education alone will lead them to the life of the whole. Plato described a slave as "one who in his actions does not express his own ideas." The citizen, says Aristotle, is one who makes the life of the State his own. Measured by the best Greek standard, most men among us are not free.

Most of us have moments of believing that our world is poor enough at best as a residence for a human soul, but that aspiration that must live in but a narrow space and a much narrower time can hardly escape a continuous discontent. Universal education of the best possible kind will not create a new force within any man, but it will help him to satisfactory expression of that which already moves within him. Why *must* culture and use always go hand-in-hand? Why do we always have food-bringing and soul-delighting studies? Because man is more than meat and his body is more than raiment, although it is these also; and the cultural is as useful as the food-bringing, for it feeds a human hunger not a whit less real.

Long years of evolution have served to actualize a being with a wide range of vision before whose powers of comprehension space and time tend to become unrealities. Is it not a perversion of the evolutionary order to make him the servant of a narrow space and a limited time? Is his thinking to minister to his body alone, or also to minister to itself? The function of a rational being is chiefly to be rational, not to persist or to be

made to persist in an animal existence. And all the protests of labor, all the revolutions of the people, all the discontent and most of the misery of the poor—these are but a vague and blind revolt against being confined in an un-understandable world. What will change it? Nothing but that which will make men more at home in the world. Not merely food and shelter; they would satisfy an animal, but they alone will not satisfy a man. In addition he must be taught so far as possible the meaning of the world in which he finds himself—of his labor, of his society, of his State; and the accumulated experience of the human race when put at his service in the best possible manner, as it is in the school, is poor enough at best when it is called upon to solve the mighty riddle which the sphinx within him asks.

I know *well* the answer that men make to such a doctrine—that such an education serves only to make men discontented; that it unfits them for the hewing and carrying of life. I deny it entirely. How can the use of one's eyes unfit him for the use of his hands? But if he is blindfolded he cannot use his hands so well. The eye was made to coöperate with the hand. How can the employment of the whole mind, which sees through the eyes and moves through the hands, interfere with the work of any one of these? To employ but one part of a necessary whole is to put that part in opposition to the whole—to weaken it. What is the objection to universal education? That it unfits men for their work. Yet cultural education is necessary to fit the professional man to begin the work of his profession, and the forms of general education are not trade schools. Something must be radically wrong in a world in which the same process both fits and unfits men for their work. Why does education fit the professional man for his work and unfit the laborer for his? I can find no logical reason for this result. I am compelled to say that the statement is false, although it seems to be true, and has become a common law through the approving votes of an overwhelming majority. Education cannot unfit him for his work—it may unfit the present conditions in which that work is performed for him. It may bring about better hours, better places, better estimation of labor; but unfit

him for his work it cannot, for the chief factor in determining his work is the pronoun, not the noun.

I have noticed that civilization is in the habit of advancing because of just such divine discontent. And that discontent that comes of education will have a great advantage, for it will be able to formulate and to express itself clearly—in which case the progress will be greater than ever before. It is not a trifling thing to impose fixed conditions upon human souls. The time was in the history of the Church when education unfitted men for membership in it, but a better Church was the result. The time was in the history of the State when education menaced the State and men could no longer live in it—and a better State came. Surely nothing is fixed but men themselves, and their fixity is the fixity of conscious movement, which enriches itself as it moves; and this is the only guaranty of progress. One cannot fail to have much sympathy for that man who feels that his work is unworthy of him, for he is either in the way to better himself by unlearning his error or to better society by performing a more fitting service.

There is a saying among philosophers that a half philosophy leads away from God, while a true philosophy leads to God. Education—a genuine education, which is something more than formal—will enlarge the horizon and give each a sense of the social value of his labor. It will teach him to look upon activity as life, and will substitute the word *life* for the word *labor*; he will feel a keen sense of his relation to that vast human world which shares with him its gains, demanding only that he shall share his own. He will come to know something of the majesty of being and to correct the false judgment that depreciates the worth of many that it may appreciate the worth of one. He will discover that common self of feeling and desire which strives with him instead of against him, as he is wont to think. He will rejoice in its rejoicing, be interested in its interests, share in its gains, succeed in its successes. He will discover his own moral nature and at length discover a wherefore for the world. Such an education, which will form him as a citizen of the world by enabling him to live in a world suffi-

ciently large to be self-explanatory, will give occupation when he is idle, rest when he is weary, distraction when he is bored, comfort when he is cast down, and through all a much larger peace; for only knowledge can create a vital peace. And the peace that cometh of understanding is not the privilege of the scholar; it is not a private but a social good, and should be as freely offered for use as are the wares of the artisan. A growing insight into the nature of the human being will at length turn its possession as completely into a necessity as it is now a luxury.

These are not vast claims, but they run the risk of seeming to be words alone. More in detail, what will a larger and more vital education do for men? It will substitute productive thinking for destructive hallucinations. It will close the saloon. It will substitute great human perplexing problems—the risks, the darings of the race—for extemporized games of chance. It will remove the vices of blind impulse by making blind impulse to see. It will rationalize consumption by enabling men to discover the necessary and to separate it from the wasteful. It will bring the whole man to his work, not a protesting part of him. It will identify the interest of the employer and employee—and anything short of such intellectual discernment is an abstract and incomplete identification. Socialism, law, accident—nothing besides will do this, not because they demand too much but because they demand too little.

I have noticed that the best carpenters, the best iron-workers, the best cigar-makers, the best street-sweepers were those who knew most, not of their business alone, but of the hopes and aspirations and successes of other men, who had a sense of the social value of their labor. The eight-hour day is in large part a failure. Why? Because the worker cannot use his spare time and so abuses it; but the eight-hour day and the six-hour day begin to be economic necessities. There is a point beyond which civilization cannot extend save by intension — beyond which it cannot broaden save by deepening. Why are our manufactures of so poor a kind, and why are wages so low? Not alone because manufacturers make and pay so poorly, but be-

cause the consumer is compelled to select upon the criteria of price alone—in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred knowing neither his real need nor what will satisfy it. Bad money drives out good money. Bad taste drives out good taste. Ignorance fights with knowledge for control.

John Ruskin, that great philosopher of the spirit if not of the form, has well said that "there is no wealth but life—life, including all its powers of love, of joy, and of admiration." "Whatsoever ye do to the least of these ye do it unto me" is not limited to cups of water. Socrates, that master spirit of the Greeks, thought it worth while to spend his life in bringing home to the minds of the shoemakers, the carpenters, and the armorers of Athens principles of private conduct and political judgment such as they were wont to use in their trades. He thought it worth while to spend his life in extending their interests to include society, the State, and God. He spent as much time with them as he devoted to the rich young men of Athens. He was a cosmopolitan teacher. Surely that is not an advance beyond him which has made or tends to make the teacher a respecter of persons! A government that names itself democracy, by that act chooses to advance by the way of education alone. One is not educated in it because he may one day be President. He is judge, lawmaker, and executioner now. Can all men be educated? All who *are* men can. Will universal education dethrone the scholar? No more than it will dethrone the truth which is his scholarship. He cannot afford to allow a single talent to go unearthened that will work with him in his mighty task. The keenest lack that the scholar feels is lack of discoverers, and next to it is the lack that compels him not only to find the truth but also to drive it home—to make it operative. Universal education will free him from the dead weight of custom and convention, which, perceiving nothing but the static present, weighs upon discovery like a pall.

It is objected to Extension work and to the Settlement movement that there is not a royal road to knowledge—that these movements are fraudulent if they claim to offer such a road.

It is because of this very failure of anything but the education of the schools to educate that that education must become universal.

Few will deny that education as ordinarily practised is not intended to serve such ends as these. Unfortunately, it is still in the Sophistic stage of shaping men to conform to the demands of a given social convention rather than to express themselves. But that there is a Socratic education that will enable a man to come to his true stature, and that it can be and is even now being applied, the work of a multitude of teachers will attest. For them culture has once again taken on its better meaning. It is not formal—not mere possession of the dry husks of anything. Culture is domesticity. The cultured man is one whose heart is no longer skin-bounded, but beats in things outside himself. True culture will make him at home in the world as he is at home in the family. The oracular words of Socrates are as true for the laborer as for the prince: "An unexamined life is not one which is fit to be lived by man." Surely it is his due to have all of human acquisition striving with him to abet its examination.

ERNEST CARROLL MOORE.

Berkeley, Cal.

THE ICONOCLAST AS A BUILDER.

IT has often been charged against freethinkers and agnostics that they are ready enough to tear down but are *not* very ready to build up. The charge has been a just one, and for this reason thousands of men who agree substantially with the agnostics are to-day quietly holding their places in the churches. It is better, they argue, and with some reason, to remain with their families, beneath this time-honored shelter, than to wander forth into a world whose only shelter is the uncertain heavens. The old homes may be rife with superstitions and may teach "facts" at variance with science and logic; yet, along with the false, they teach much that is true, and very much that is helpful. In fact, outside of private homes, they are almost the only places where a strict morality is strenuously taught. There are many thoughtful men who agree with the old Roman, Numa Pompilius, that religion fosters culture, and also with him that it is better to receive it "miraculously"—from some divine Egeria—than not to have it at all. Moreover, it is conceded that the setting apart of one day in seven for the better cultivation of our moral sense is eminently wise. These things being so, it is not strange that conservative men have been slow to leave their places in the churches.

But, suppose it to be possible—yea, that it prove on trial easy of accomplishment—to erect a temple wherein only *truth* shall be taught; wherein men may be drawn from the material to the spiritual side of life, wherein a pure morality will be strenuously contended for, and wherein will be inculcated a love for whatsoever things are honest, high, beautiful; and suppose, further, that in conjunction with this new worship (we may well call it so) the Christian Sunday, perhaps with some slight modifications, be still maintained—what, let me ask, would be the effect upon those who still retain their seats in the old churches but not their beliefs in the old faith? It would not

empty the churches, for there is, and perhaps there will always be, a large number of people who have no difficulty in accepting the supernatural; but, in my opinion, there would be a large exodus of intelligent men and women from them, and these uniting with others of like mind in the community would erect a temple wherein they would feel at home, and would establish therein a worship whereby they and their children would grow in all the graces of the spirit.

In some cities there are associations that have taken the name of The Secular League. They are made up for the most part of intelligent persons that have lost their religious beliefs. But I like not their name. We are too prone now to follow secular things; what we need, and are now seeking, is how, at times, to get away from the world—from secularism—and how to find in its stead spirituality.

Let us suppose that a meeting was called in one of our large cities—say Washington; that the call was to all those who think for themselves in matters of religion; that it was extensively advertised, and then that it was duly held and was in every respect a success: that an organization was effected by the election of the usual officers and the selection of certain committees. First, there is a building committee, whose duty will be to select a lot in the central part of the city and erect thereon a house suitable for the purposes of the association. This temple should be beautiful without and within. The auditorium should be modeled after that of the modern theater, except that the stage would have less space; there would be no boxes, and there would be an organ. There would be also space in front of the stage for an orchestra. In the decoration of the interior, including the windows, the legends and incidents portrayed would not be confined to any one race or to any one period of time.

Adjoining the auditorium, as in many modern churches, should be a room for the Sunday-school. It could be used also as a lecture-room and as a place for social gatherings. There should also be fitted up a reading-room, to be open to all the congregation, including the larger children. It should be

equipped with the best magazines and the daily papers of Washington and New York. There could be also, if the members wished it, a library in the same room. Opening into the reading-room should be another apartment to be devoted to amusement. This could be equipped with billiard tables and all the appurtenances required for smaller games, such as chess, checkers, and cards. Another room of this adjunct may be fitted up as a gymnasium. Such is a brief outline of the proposed temple. Of course, the details will vary according to individual tastes and the financial strength of the different assemblies.

At the organization another committee was appointed charged with the duty of selecting some one to lead in their public functions; some one to be to them, in part at least, what the pastor is to the church. The work of this committee is a difficult one, owing to the fact that no men have been trained for such service as would be required of such an official. He must be broadly intelligent. He must know history. He must have knowledge of all religious cults—of their rise and development; of all systems of philosophy and of the evolution of ethics especially among European races. He must have a fair understanding of the sciences and be conversant with literature, ancient and modern. In addition to this equipment of knowledge, he must have the abilities of the public speaker with the earnestness of the reformer. Ten years later it will be easier to find such a man. But even now the men will be found, because in every movement that marks the progress of the race, whether along spiritual or material lines, men have been found to carry it forward. To be the spiritual leader of an intelligent constituency such as I have described would be indeed a most honorable position—one so high and worthy that it would be sought by the most intellectual of our young men: something that cannot be claimed for the office of the Christian pastor. For some reason—is it the decline of faith?—in recent years our strongest young men have not entered the Christian ministry.

It will be the duty of another committee to form a program of the exercises—what in the churches would be called a serv-

ice-program. By this the hour for the children's meeting, or Sunday-school, would be fixed; also the hours for the Sunday services and probably for a meeting some evening in the week.

There would be much *music* in all the services. There are now only a few hymns that would be suitable, but an abundance of other excellent music. In a few years the Doddridges and Hebers among the congregation would see to it that we had a hymnal.

Shall formal prayers be a part of this service? For myself, I would omit them, trusting rather to make the whole service one of real prayer—an aspiration after high things.

And now comes the most important part in this process of rebuilding. It is in answer to the questions, What is to be taught in the Sunday-school? and, What is to be the burden and aim of the leader's discourses? The first may be answered by one word, *morality*. Not the morality of an ancient religion like the Jewish, whose founders, notwithstanding their decalogue, countenanced all manner of crimes, save idolatry—nor the morality of medieval times, whose fierce partizanship dwarfed the obligations of kindness and justice; but rather that morality which has been put forth by the best men of all the ages, and especially of this enlightened modern age. We now *know* what things are right and what are wrong—what tend to good and what to evil; and we know, with Paul, that to be carnally minded is death but to be spiritually minded is life. We would teach an honesty far higher than that of expediency. We would teach moderation, temperance, patriotism, and withal Jesus' law of love and his lessons of unselfishness. We would *not* teach theology, because, strictly speaking, there is no such thing.

The answer to the second question, What is to be the burden and aim of the leader's discourses? has been given largely in our answer to the first. The burden will be right living, or we may call it ethical culture, and the aim *sana mens in sano corpore*—but *sana* in a very broad sense. A man may have the intellect of a Webster, but if he be capable of a dishonorable act his mind is not *sound*. *Sana* then includes all the best qualities

of the mind. Spiritual perception and aspiration, a high sense of honor, and whatsoever other qualities go to make a gentleman, must belong to it. The aim of the Church has been the salvation of souls, and the very same will be the aim of the godless preachers in our new temples. Let a man's feet be planted on the rock of Personal Integrity and he is saved *now*, and, if he is immortal, forever.

But the public teacher, if he is successful, must be something far more than a didactician. He must entertain as well as instruct. The world is his field, and he will know how to cull from it; the history of the world is his Bible. He can take his texts from Plato, Jesus, Epictetus, Marcus Aurelius, Shakespeare, Emerson, or any other sage who has come to men with a message. The annals of Greece and Rome furnish many illustrious examples of patriotism, of truthfulness, and of virtue. But no race has been more prolific of men devoted to duty than the one we claim as our own, and no age can count so many of them as the present. Indeed, our leaders will deal largely with current events—those questions of the day which are pressing for answer.

Why say more? The temple is built, and the people, intelligent and earnest, are crowding into it. The man will come presently who is to lead them; he will come with a message that they can *understand*—with words of wisdom that will *help* them on life's journey.

This new temple is, let us say, in central Washington. In a few years we will expect to see a similar one arise in the north-western part of the city, and again another in the eastern part. So will the movement spread.

Come, gentlemen,—ye silent dwellers in homes not yours,—shall the meeting be called?

SHALER G. HILLYER.

Lamar, Col.

WIVES, WIDOWS, AND WILLS.

ONE of the most perplexing problems that we are called upon to solve is to discover the ratio of a woman's value, as sweetheart, wife, and possible widow, in the estimation of man in each of his various rôles of lover, husband, and testator. When a man is seeking to obtain the consent of the girl of his choice, to unite her life and fortunes with his, he thinks that he is ready to surrender almost anything in order to secure that consent. The marriage vow presents no obstacle. He says, unhesitatingly, "With all my worldly goods I thee endow;" but afterward the vow is forgotten or entirely ignored, and has no legal validity whatever.

Strange to say, as years roll by and the wife becomes the mother of their children, as well as his ever-ready helper in a thousand ways, he forgets his promises and vows so entirely that frequently she finds herself scarcely supplied with ready cash for the daily needs of the home of which she is the most important factor, while her own clothing supply becomes to her a constant source of trial or a problem impossible of solution. Her self-supporting, unmarried woman friend has greater pecuniary independence than she can hope for in the home where she is the most important, and when absent the most seriously missed, member of the household. There is never found another who can and will half fill the place for any pay. She is at once wife, mother, housekeeper, nurse, seamstress, and often woman-of-all-work in the average home, without either wages or appreciation of any sort. An ordinary servant has greater liberty in spending without rendering an account to any one of her cash outlay. The few honorable exceptions here and there only serve to emphasize the rule in this respect. Nor is this all. There have been too many instances where immediately after entering the bonds of matrimony the woman has found herself bereft of her own patrimony: herself and her belong-

ings becoming the property of her husband with no reluctance upon his part at assuming the ownership.

If, after years of wifehood and child-bearing, she died, the children that she left behind soon found a step-mother and a new brood of children living upon the money of their own mother. These facts are patent and incontrovertible. On the other hand, if the husband passed first to other scenes, his will was found to be a study and a marvel in its injustice. Men have been known to will away from their wives the property that they received through their marriage with them. And even the guardianship of the children has been given to others by the testator.

In old times there was a queer law—a relic of a barbaric period, like many another that could be cited. It was called the “widow’s quantum.” Under its restrictions, if a man died intestate, or failed to provide in his will for his widow to retain the home, then, after a lapse of “forty days” from the demise of her high lord, the forlorn woman was obliged to leave the shelter of her married life and find a place of refuge for herself as best she could elsewhere. The next of kin, *on the side of her neglectful husband*, walked in and took possession. It is reasonable to suppose that, under the urgent necessity for so hasty a removal, the widow must inevitably have dried her tears for the departed very soon. While taking her own hurried leave of roof and shelter, if she shed any tears they would naturally have flowed because of the pathos of her own sorry plight. Widowed and homeless all at once!

It is within the recollection of some of our active reformers that upon the day of her wedding a woman passed, with all of her belongings—the bridal trousseau included—into the ownership of her spouse. Some one has remarked, facetiously, that in those not very remote days “*all married women* wore men’s clothes, as they owned nothing themselves.” Evolution be thanked, those “good old days” have passed away, and women now may congratulate themselves that their lines are fallen in pleasanter times.

But there yet remains ample room for improvement in

the laws, and the existing customs consequent upon those laws. In making their wills now, men do not always prove themselves models of wisdom and justice. Men will leave the manifestation of love for and gratitude to their wives altogether out of the question. Old ideas are long in being outgrown, even when through the lapse of time they have been worn threadbare and flimsy.

In the ranks of the wealthy, when wills are made public, the same ancient barbaric sentiment regarding the status of a wife or widow seems to hold sway. Many widows of rich men have found themselves unable to continue in the style of living to which they were accustomed, because of the restricted incomes left to them by their husbands. There have been instances where the children found it necessary to unite in forming a fund to enable their mother to keep up the great establishments that the husband's and father's will obliged her to retain and maintain during her own lifetime. Nor could she by any sale unload herself of her heavy burdens. These are not unique cases.

And what shall be said of the wills of some of our millionaire magnates that are known and read of all men, where the faithful wife and mother finds herself poor compared with any one of her children, and with less liberty in the disposing of her own portion than any one of them? After spending the years from early wifehood to the time when some of her children are married, and all or almost all are grown up—after occupying the position of mistress of the household during those years—when the will of her deceased husband is opened she finds that every child that she has gone down to the gates of death to bear for him has been left with a fortune multiplying her own several times; and perhaps one untried youth—a mere stripling—becomes by his father's behest the "head of the family," with the lion's share of those manifold millions left to him to do with unreservedly as he pleases. A boy made by a few strokes of a pen the head of the house, and so much richer than his own mother that her proportion sinks into insignificance beside that of her son!

Proceedings of this sort are relics of the old Jewish, Roman, and English laws concerning the status of woman. Under those dispensations she never for a moment owned herself, but passed from her father's to her husband's possession—a chattel always. The modern custom of "giving away" the bride points back to those days of everlasting bondage. If she inherited at all she did so under the old common law of England, "as the sister of her son." Her own rank was below that of her boy, even if he were only an infant in arms.

It may well give us pause to consider the wonderful advantages that have ever belonged to the sex masculine and to ask why. The vested and accrued interests of that heritage are indeed incalculable, and pass beyond all human understanding, even in this year of grace nineteen hundred and two. It seems much more desirable to be a child than to have been the wife of a deceased man. Better to be a *son* than to hold any other relationship to a testator, if one could only have the chance to choose!

Many years ago, before statutory enactments had made some desirable changes in the old common law that we inherited with other ancient customs and ideas from dear Mother England, there was a young seamstress whose one ambition was to own a writing-desk and bureau combined—the same that we now see in the old-fashioned "secretary." To gratify her wish she worked early and late and saved her earnings until she was able to make the purchase and see her vision materialize in the coveted piece of furniture established in her own little home. After enjoying it for a time she married, and, according to the law then prevailing, she ceased to own anything. Her husband entered into possession of all her effects when he took her to wife.

After a while he "shuffled off the mortal coil," leaving her a childless widow.

Then came the first of a series of tragic events in her life history. Her household goods—the dearly bought desk included—were all appraised as belonging to her deceased lord's estate. In order to retain her beloved desk she *bought it again*,

One would suppose that she had received a salutary and never-to-be-forgotten lesson. But, nay—in time another man came to woo the industrious, hard-working woman. She listened to his suit. He won. Again she lost her "secretary," with herself, in life matrimonial.

Years elapsed until she faced widowhood and the inevitable appraisers once more. Her twice purchased desk could not be hers undisputed until she again paid the appraised valuation.

As time glided on, lonely and widowed, but in full possession of her little property, she lived, peacefully and contentedly. Either she or her belongings must have been very attractive, for soon there came another suitor to pay his court to her, and perhaps incidentally to her real and personal estate. Doubtless the latter was alluring. Wonders will never cease! She was almost persuaded to pronounce the fateful affirmative that would again impoverish her. But, fortunately, as the two sat in converse, the would-be husband number three, while formulating the momentous question unconsciously leaned toward *the desk* and took hold of a drawer-handle with which he dallied, possibly to relieve his laudable embarrassment, while thinking how he should deliver himself of his proposal.

Now, the good angels of the widow were near, or perhaps the evil genii of the man presided. Her attention was drawn to the hand that he was so generously proffering for her acceptance. All at once a tide of memories surged through her brain recalled by that one act of the wooper. *His* hand upon *her* desk! Experiences too vivid for another rash step awoke and saved her from running the risk of their repetition. She was thoroughly roused and on the defensive. When the formal proposal had been made, and it was her turn to speak the decisive word, her answer came in no uncertain tone:

"No! I have bought that 'secretary' three times. I intend to own it absolutely hereafter. I shall *never* buy it again!"

Some one will say, times have changed, and the laws also. Women now receive much more consideration and have greater privileges than ever before in the world's history. Certainly, we hope so, for the credit of the race and as a proof that man-

kind is evolving into higher conditions than obtained of yore. But is this a reason for the stagnation that comes from self-satisfaction? Shall any man or woman be permitted to stop or clog the wheels of progress? Rather let "onward forever and upward" always be our watchwords—"eternal progression" our motto.

There are States in this "free Republic" where the law allows a man to claim and collect the daily earnings of his wife. And there are other sustained laws, equally inequitable, touching woman's relation to man. Some of these laws pass belief. If all women knew of them there would be immediate revolution instead of our slow evolution away from them.

Only a few years ago, in Brooklyn, N. Y., the child of a widow was run over and killed by the cars. When suit was brought against the railroad company, the verdict rendered by Judge Allen was that, "as the father of the child was dead, there was no *lawful* beneficiary." Consequently, that "most righteous and learned judge" granted to the stricken mother—"ninety dollars for funeral expenses;"—not in justice, but in charity, we must suppose.

And now a late case reveals the present condition of the law in Nebraska. A boy of fourteen years was killed by a train of the Armour Packing Company while using the rails of the C. N. & St. P. Railway. In recent years he had assisted his mother in the support of the family, "*the father having deserted them all ten years ago.*" The judge admitted a claim, but decided against the mother—for the reason that, according to the statute of Nebraska, only "*the next of kin*" could bring suit, and *this particular relationship belonged to the father*. Therefore, the mother could not appear as plaintiff, "*the father having lost nothing by the boy's death,*" because he had not reaped any advantage from his earnings! There was *no one entitled* to any damages. Here language fails. And yet, in the face of these and similar glaring cases, we hear it said that the laws are more generous to women than to men!

The "age of consent law" stands a monstrous contradiction to any such declaration, in any and every State of the Union.

Justice is still distant, beckoning to us from mountain heights as yet unscaled by the thought of man in general. A steady ascent it must be, even if we are to reach at last the vision and then attain the realization of equity. Nowhere is this necessity more evident than in the attitude toward their wives of many of those who are called "our good men," and above all in the effete ideas manifested by them in the making of their last wills and testaments. The cold law now insures to the widow of a man dying intestate one-third of his estate.

Men are often less kind to their prospective widows, in their testamentary documents, than the impersonal, soulless law. Their wills are frequently enormous evidences of the weakest and least admirable side of their characters. Surely there should be extraordinary and excellent reasons when a wife, mother, or widow is compelled to rank lower than the children to whom she has given birth and nurture; and this whether during the married life of the parents or in the making and administration of a will.

M. E. CARTER.

New York.

HE FOUND LIFE.

A STORY.

BY LUELLA R. KRAYBILL.

It was a night, bitterly cold, of impenetrable darkness and oppressive gloom. The roaring of the wind seemed but the wail of crushed and desolate lives, and the creaking of the sleet the snapping of human heart-cords. It was one of those times when the outer or objective world fails to engage one's thoughts, but rather turns the soul back upon itself to retrospection and analysis, to its own moral blight and gloom—if such it has.

A giant of commercialism, a man with all the accouterments and power of unlimited wealth, sat alone and reflective in the library of his palatial home this cheerless January evening. He had given every physical energy and mental effort of his life to the accumulation of great wealth, and had succeeded; but to-night he felt the emptiness of his life as he had never realized it before. His soul seemed as hungry and emaciated as the body of the famine-stricken sufferer.

For years this man had believed that greater wealth and greater power would ultimately appease the inner longing, the unquenchable thirst of his life; but he realized to-night as never before that man is both a physical and a spiritual being, and, to live the fully rounded life, the soul as well as the body must be adequately nourished. Not only was his life empty, but to-night it was impossible for him to escape the goadings of his conscience; and the dense outer darkness seemed but a reflection of his soul's moral gloom.

Some years before he had married a beautiful and kindly-hearted young woman, who had died and left him two very interesting children. He appreciated his family, yet it had been

much as a side issue, while the accumulation of great wealth had been the one absorbing purpose of his life.

In one direction from this man's suburban mansion stretched his acres of valuable lands, while in another direction were to be seen his factories, the smoke of which shut out the light of day for those who toiled within them. Huddled on the lands nearby are the rows and groups of cottages or coops occupied by the factory employees, whose lives know little else than incessant toil and privation. These toilers produce an average of eight dollars a day, of which less than one-fourth is returned to them. The remaining six dollars go to swell the coffers of the commercial king, who must find a foreign market for the goods American labor has produced—and of which it is sorely in need.

The legitimate wage of labor is what it produces, but under the private ownership of land and the instruments of production there is no method by which labor may be secured in its own. Our large fortunes represent nothing but our unpaid labor and products, and under our competitive system there is no method by which this gigantic wrong may be righted.

This employer laid the foundation of his fortune in his early business career by putting a salable commodity on the market while profits were yet large and undivided by the inevitable competition of our growing manufacturing facilities. With the wealth accumulated in earlier times he had been able to manipulate the competition of later days. That his own business might be increased he had been as aggressive and relentless as the proverbial sea-pirate or Visi-Goth. He had ruined individuals by the hundred and not less than a score of towns, and to-night the roar of the winds lashed his soul as might the wail of the women and children whom he had rendered homeless. He remembered a noted statesman once said that manipulation caused more suffering than war, famine, and pestilence combined.

What meant this awful gloom—these terrible goadings? Was it presentiment, a feeling that unjust conditions must sooner or later produce disastrous effects?

"What! What——" he exclaimed, in all the agony of a soul at last awakened and fully cognizant of its crimes, when—crash! crash!

He turned in his chair. A man had dashed through the window, and, frenzied and panting, was pointing a revolver at his head; a man, bronzed and disheveled, and upon whose face both despair and desperation were stamped in *bas relief*.

"You human monster!" he muttered, "you treated me like a dog—now you can die like one!" And he grasped Van Hous-ten by the collar. "You crushed my life and made it a living hell, and now I'll take yours!"

How well, indeed, did the commercial lion remember this man—once the most trusted and sacrificing of all his em-ployees! And he sat silent and shrinking like the criminal he was.

"No, Van," continued Deerborn, "you haven't forgotten a page of my history. I began in your employ at the lowest rung of the ladder and worked nearly to the top. I was ambitious and saving. Although without the social position accorded to wealth I married a young woman as beautiful and intelligent as your own wife. We had two children as promising as your own and in every respect as deserving. I had worked well up when another underbid me a few dollars and I was dropped. But I had saved my money and started a business of my own. I was succeeding, and life seemed full of hope; but you with all your millions craved the little that was giving me a com-petent living. You opened a store just across the street from me and sold goods fifty per cent. below cost. I was forced to close out, and then you set your own prices and got your money back from the people. Again I became an employee, and this time was dropped through consolidation of firms. Misfortune followed misfortune until I was compelled to look into the faces of my hungry and thinly-clad wife and children while you were adding your thousands at every turn of the wheels. Hungry, I broke into one of your well-filled stores and you sent me to the penitentiary. Before God, I say it was *you* who should have gone there, and not I! Like Jean Valjean, I took from a

store of plenty to appease the hunger of children; and in my soul I know that those who can look indifferently upon such conditions are greater criminals than we. Are men to be content where children go hungry on the one hand and millions are spent for baubles on the other? Are men to be content where honest labor that has *produced* all its life must cringe like a slave before filched capital for the privilege of earning a daily wage that enables them not to live, but merely to exist? These awful wrongs have maddened me, and I vowed that if you could crush my life I would take yours. Yes; I am here in my stripes, not yet having seen my family. Your insatiate greed has led you to every possible financial crime. You vampire, are you ready to die?" And the man with flashing eyes again clutched Van Housten's throat.

"Stay, my friend!" came the tones of a firm, modulated voice; and both men turned to view the owner. A woman was approaching them from the further end of the room. She was in elegant evening attire. She was yet young, and with a face of that higher beauty which reveals the lines of thought and discrimination.

"Celeste! Celeste!" muttered Deerborn; and his face instantly changed from that of a frenzied madman to that of a welcoming friend. "Yea, I stay my hand," said he. "If there are devils on earth there are angels as well, and may justice some day put greed to shame until it forever hides its face!" And Deerborn stood in reverence of her who had given his wife and children a home through the long years of his imprisonment.

The color came again into Van Housten's face, his muscles relaxed, and he gazed into the face of the woman who had power to know him just as he was.

"Mr. Van Housten," said Celeste Renan, "less than an hour ago, while at the Herndon social function, I answered a light rap at a side door that was unnoticed by the servants and found there a thin, shivering woman who sank to the floor in her weakness. She pointed in the direction of your Norwood tenement. We took her there. Her husband, who was

for years an employee of yours but for the last year an invalid, lies a corpse. Their only child is famishing from cold and hunger. The commonest labor is an absolute necessity of every line of your business, but it is too poorly paid to provide itself against misfortune. I know you will never again allow an employee of yours to suffer as this one has done. Illness and starvation uncared for under the shadows of mighty domes and, the abodes of voluptuous living! Our civilization, gorgeous but soulless, proves that its evolution out of primal savagery is as yet but partial. The legitimate wage of labor is what it produces, and to-day the world has begun to ask, By what method can we secure labor in its own? And the question will never cease until the problem is solved—until justice is done. I overheard Mr. Deerborn's threat to take your life. He is the material and you the moral victim of this nefarious competitive system, or reign of industrial anarchy, under which we live. You have wronged him as greatly as he believes, but to take life or employ physical force will not right this great and terrible wrong. Nothing but the full play of the highest intellectual and moral forces will ever accomplish it. Upon you, Mr. Van Houston, it devolves to pay Mr. Deerborn a just wage for all these wasted years.

"And," she said, addressing Deerborn, "it is not for you to take the life of individual oppressors, but to give your life to the cause of Labor's liberation—the greatest cause of the centuries. Man grows out of slavery into freedom slowly but surely. As we have outgrown master and slave, so must employer and employee disappear and all men become equal proprietors in the products of labor. No man is free who has an employer's veto over his head. The fact that life was given to man proves his right to all that would make it a growth and a joy. The masses of mankind have been elevated as greater freedom and opportunities have been granted them. Every person who is willing to perform a just portion of any work necessary to support our civilization has a divine right to the use of all its facilities, and industry should be so organized that every man could procure a competent living without crime

or anxiety. The *people*, not the few, must own and control the land, public monopolies, and the instruments of production and distribution; and every man's labor should insure him in all the material needs of life. Every opportunity in life is dependent upon economic support; hence, industrial justification means the intellectual development and moral redemption of the world. Better opportunities develop finer tastes, and where labor is fully rewarded and insured in the materials and opportunities of life there would be no occasion for manipulation, dishonesty, or subjection. Financial independence would do more to obliterate intemperance and immorality than anything else. Nowhere in the universe is there *life*—save where competition has been superseded by coöperation; and this must be brought about in our commercial world. Spend the remainder of your life among your brother-laborers, Mr. Deerborn, teaching them this great truth, that they may learn to strike scientifically and not with violence. Now, hail a cab and drive quickly to my old home, where you will find your wife and children awaiting you—a free and noble man, not a cowering murderer.

"Oh, God!" she wailed, "what might have happened had I been a moment or two later?" And for a time her face was drawn and ashen, and her form shook violently. "Ah," she said, with face and hand uplifted, "here before me are two men meant to be God's noblemen, but warped into oppressors and murderers by the competitive struggle for existence. Is man too weak, too vicious, to rise above such conditions? Ah, no, no! Ours will some day be a world of peace and of plenty. As man has grown in the past, so shall he grow in the future—until more and yet more of his perplexities are left behind. 'And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes, and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, nor any more pain, for all the former things are passed away!' Mr. Deerborn, hasten to your family. Mr. Van Housten, prepare yourself and we'll be driven rapidly to the Norwood tenement."

Ah! that shambling tenement-house, with its rotten stairways and open walls. And the commercial king was to accompany the wealthiest but least spoiled, the noblest woman of his city,

to his most neglected tenement. His cheeks flushed with shame, but the crucial fire was cleansing his soul—let it burn. And, alas! what puppets are we in the hands of fate. In so brief a space of time he had come to love this woman as he never would have believed it possible for a man to love. He had long known of her; and his love for her was not merely a case of sex magnetism—but she was his social, intellectual, and soul ideal. And the familiar lines began running through his mind:

"A woman in so far as she beholdeth
Her one beloved's face;
A mother with a great heart that enfoldeth
The children of the race.

A body, free and strong with that high beauty
That comes of perfect use, is built thereof;
A mind where reason ruleth over duty
And justice reigns with love.

A self-poised, royal soul—brave, wise, and tender;
No longer blind and dumb;
A human of an unknown splendor
Is she who is to come."

Van Housten not only loved Celeste as a woman, but he admired her intellectual powers and revered her moral supremacy. And to-day this remarkable trio—Archibald Deerborn, Joseph Van Housten, and Celeste Renan, as his wife—are giving their lives to the upbuilding of both social and individual life. Where a weak and ignorant woman would have left crime and murder, Celeste Renan had turned the forces to play in the highest channels of life.

In the personality of Celeste and the higher intellectual and social life into which she led him, Van Housten found that which satisfied the great inner longing of his life. Man has a body, but he *is* a soul; and he will never know life until he learns to live in the soul—in spiritual congeniality and affinity. The consciousness of daring to support those principles which stand for the justification and elevation of the masses brought him a satisfaction that was infinitely greater than that which came from the financial power he exercised. The more he

concealed his charities from the public the greater peace of soul he knew. He now declares that the world must move on until every life is blessed with wealth and inspired by love.

Life inspired by the highest love is divine; without this inspiration it is but a grinning phantom. Abundance for the body, and abundance for the soul balanced by justice and duty performed—and life will ascend to a scale of magnificent proportions.

TOPICS OF THE TIMES.

BY B. O. FLOWER.

ORGANIZED LABOR AND DIRECT LEGISLATION.

I. DIRECT LEGISLATION IMPERATIVELY DEMANDED.

"New occasions teach new duties; Time makes ancient good uncouth;
They must upward still, and onward, who would keep abreast of
Truth."

These words of Lowell were never truer or more applicable than they are to-day. Changed conditions and circumstances make necessary political changes in harmony with present needs, if the fundamental demands of free government are to be preserved. Not only has the social horizon broadened and enlarged since the days of the founders of the Republic; but the ancient foe of freedom, equal rights, and justice has become so powerful and its corrupt influence so marked and far-reaching that all serious students of history and lovers of republican government must appreciate the peril of the present.

In Direct Legislation alone is found the solution of the gravest problems before the friends of free government. This demand, furthermore, is in perfect alignment with the theory, ideal, and demands of the founders of our Government. Even the most conservative of the fathers held such views as were voiced by John Adams on January 1, 1787, when he wrote: "The end to be aimed at in the formation of a representative assembly seems to be the sense of the people, the public voice."

Moreover, in the old New England town-meeting we find a near approach to a truly republican method of government.

Cherishing the principles of liberty with a passion whose intensity was only equaled by the wisdom of her people, the conservative Swiss Republic extended the accepted principles of Direct Legislation in such a manner as to meet present demands of civilization and preserve a republic in fact as well as in name; and the success of her example has demonstrated the practicability of this vital safeguard of free government,

so that the objections of the friends of monarchy, imperialistic government, and of corporations and corruptionists have been proved puerile and absurd.

The pitiful cry of "cost" for popular registration of the people's vote on legislation can have no force with any student of history who is free from prejudice; for it will be perfectly evident to him that under Direct Legislation the cities, the commonwealths, and the Republic itself would alike save many times all such cost in the veto of legislation that is to-day only possible by reason of the influence of the corporations upon political bosses, legislators, and the press. Who imagines for a moment that immensely valuable franchises would be given away without consideration by cities, States, or the nation if the people had a direct vote?

The famous Colton letters, written by Collis P. Huntington, and put in evidence in a law-suit in Santa Rosa, California, are only one of several authoritative evidences of the vast sums of money used during recent decades to secure special privileges that meant millions upon millions of dollars for the few, taken from the people and only obtainable through the lavish expenditure of money and the debauching of government in its various ramifications.

The net earnings of the street-railway monopoly of Boston last year were \$3,456,395, which under municipal ownership would have gone far toward paying the running expenses of the city, or toward giving the people wealth in the way of public improvements as well as the benefits of improved service. No one knows better than the corporations and their corrupt tools that under Direct Legislation the people would enjoy the benefits of these immensely valuable franchises.

Then, again, so powerful and arrogant has become corporate greed in the Republic that the best interests of the people are frequently pushed aside for the furtherance of class interests, that the possessions of a few already overrich may be further augmented by special privileges. These dangers are so palpable that no sober-minded, self-respecting individual can longer deny them. They have long since become a supreme menace to free government.

II. A NEW VOICE FOR MAJORITY RULE.

But Direct Legislation will save the Republic from this deadly peril; and it is fortunate for liberty that, in the present crucial period, when the great press, with a few honorable exceptions,

has become practically silent when not pitifully subservient to the demands of corporate power, and when the National Government is fostering conditions that favor classes in the Republic, a body consisting of many millions of intelligent Americans—a union that, with the aid of those who already believe in and advocate the fundamentals of free government, may easily prove more powerful than a subservient press, corrupt bosses, and partisan machines—should boldly declare in favor of Direct Legislation. In an address at the last annual convention of the American Federation of Labor, December 5, 1901, President Gompers said:

"One of the great ills from which the political morale of our country suffers is the party domination, which in turn is usually dominated by a political boss. We find our people arrayed in parties against each other, when, in truth, many find themselves in sympathy with measures for which the opposite party is the sponsor. Under the party system, which implies the party boss, that which is supposed to be the lesser of the two evils is chosen. To stand for measures and principles so that we as workers may have an opportunity of petitioning for favorable, or vetoing vicious, legislation, and each question or measure being determined upon its specific merits or demerits, are some of the causes upon which the American Federation of Labor predicates its demand for Direct Legislation by the initiative and the referendum."

And, in harmony with President Gompers's views, the Federation unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"As this body is already on record as favoring the initiative and referendum, we indorse the position of the President on the subject of Direct Legislation and recommend that the 'Winnetka System' be explained in the '*American Federationist*' in order that trade-unionists may be enabled to study it as carefully as it deserves."

Since then the organization has made itself felt on more than one occasion on this important question, perhaps the most notable illustration being the recent demand made by organized labor upon the Legislature of Massachusetts for the favorable consideration of the Initiative and Referendum. On the night of February 24 there assembled at the State House, before the Committee on Constitutional Amendments of the Massachusetts Legislature, more than fifteen hundred representative wage-earners of Boston and other cities of the commonwealth, who represented upward of 80,000 members of organized labor. They were as earnest and thoughtful a body as has assembled in the capital of Massachusetts in years, and according to Chairman Bliss of the Committee, after the meeting, they "evinced

the greatest display of common-sense oratory ever heard" "It was," says the *Boston Post*, "unquestionably an epoch in the history of organized labor in Massachusetts, as nearly every section of the State was represented." The hearing extended from 7:30 till 10 o'clock. All the speakers were temperate, thoughtful, and intensely earnest. Underneath the respectful plea was very evident that manly determination that is the hope of free government. The newspapers of Boston, however, with two exceptions, were strangely asleep to the importance and the significance of this great petition. Perhaps the coming of a "real live prince" to the commonwealth, together with the importance of certain social functions, prize-fights, and murders, made such heavy demands upon their columns that the solemn petition of fifteen hundred American citizens representing over eighty thousand voters and headed by such representative citizens as the veteran champion of industrial rights, George E. McNeill, and the scholarly social reformer, Henry Demarest Lloyd, that in the judgment of the editors it was inexpedient to notice the great gathering in more than a cursory manner.

It is probable that the Massachusetts Legislature of this year will pay small heed to the plea of the people; but the campaign in the old Bay State is just opening, and it will not close until the friends of free government have rescued the State from the grasp of the corporations by the extension of the principles of Direct Legislation. The auspicious opening of the campaign in Massachusetts is at once significant and inspiring. The Federation of Labor can count upon the earnest and active aid of social reformers of every school, and of all patriots who love freedom better than party and who appreciate the immense importance of securing the right of the Initiative and Referendum in maintaining a true Republic.

Another result of far-reaching importance, following upon the action of the Federation, is found in the issuance of an extra number of the *American Federationist*, in which Mr. George H. Shibley presents an exhaustive treatise on Direct Legislation.* In this valuable treatise Mr. Shibley explains at length the Winnetka plan, by which the voters may secure the benefits of Direct Legislation immediately and in a perfectly practicable manner. In relating the history of the

*This valuable pamphlet should be in the hands of all readers of THE ARENA. It contains 80 pages and presents a clear and comprehensive survey of the question of majority rule. Price, 10 cents. Published by the American Federation of Labor, Washington, D. C.

movement for Direct Legislation in Winnetka and its bearing on the action of the voters elsewhere, Mr. Shibley observes:

"In Illinois the monopolists have prevented the voters in cities from deciding for themselves the questions pertaining to city monopolies, *and thereby have kept in the few men in the city council the power to give away the city monopolies.* Some years ago, in Winnetka, Ill., a village of 1,800 people, situated sixteen miles north of Chicago, on the Northwestern Railway, the village board of trustees was about to give to a private corporation a forty-year franchise for supplying gas. At that time the citizens were holding each month a public meeting for the discussion of public questions—'Town Meetings' is the name they apply to these gatherings. While the pending forty-year franchise was being considered by the Elected Rulers (the few men who composed the Board of Trustees), the time came around for the 'town meeting,' and, very naturally, the question which came up for discussion was the proposed franchise for gas. It clearly appeared that the voters did not legally possess the power to veto the contracts negotiated by their agents (the village trustees). The unbusinesslike character of the situation appealed so forcibly to the citizens who were present that a resolution was framed asking that the trustees of the village submit the proposed contract to their principals, the voters. Then when the evening came around on which the Village Board were to pass the ordinance the leading citizens turned out *en masse*, and one of them, Mr. Henry D. Lloyd, secured the floor and talked for two hours. *He urged that the question be referred to the voters.* Finally the Board voted to do so. The Referendum Election was held, and the result was only 4 votes for the franchise and 180 against it. This settled the proposed franchise. And it did much more. *The experience taught the voters their power.* At the next primary election for the nomination of Trustees, the voters mutually agreed that only those men should be nominated who would stand up and pledge that, if elected, they would refer to the voters all important measures."

III. WHAT DIRECT LEGISLATION WILL DO.

Direct Legislation will give to the voters in a degree impossible in any other manner a government of, for, and by the people. It will prevent the corruption and debauching of legislators. It will insure honesty and economy in government not possible under present conditions. It will rescue the Republic from the supreme foes of honest and pure politics and of free government—the corporation, the political boss, and the machine. Instead of proving an enormous expense, it will in the end prove the greatest measure of economy ever introduced, as in the defeat of measures by which the city, State,

and government are annually plundered of inestimably valuable franchises and in securing honesty and economy in the administration of government, no less than in securing just and equitable legislation by which all the citizens will share in benefits to which they are justly entitled, the Republic will each year save incomparably more than the cost of elections would be for a whole decade. Let every true American join with the Federation and push the demands of Direct Legislation. Let this be a battle-cry on the lips of Freedom's hosts—the watchword of every lover of honest politics and republican government.

* * *

IS THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE A TREASONABLE DOCUMENT THAT MEN- ACES MODERN IMPERIALISTIC REPUBLICANISM?

Mr. Joseph K. Ohl, a valued special correspondent of the Atlanta *Constitution*, recently contributed to his paper the following piece of news, well calculated to startle and bring the blush of shame to every brow where old-time patriotism and love of justice and liberty still hold supremacy on the throne of reason:

"It was discovered that there were being circulated among the Filipinos copies of the American Declaration of Independence, done in English and Spanish in parallel columns. One of the best officers, a man regarded as conservative and no extremist, told us *this was promptly suppressed*, and gave it as his opinion that the Declaration of Independence is '*a dangerous incendiary document*.'

Here we have a startling illustration of the depths of shame to which corporate greed and militarism have already brought the Republic. If five years ago one of our statesmen had had the hardihood to predict that within a decade the Declaration of Independence would be officially suppressed as a treasonable document in a land over which the Stars and Stripes floated, he would have been promptly denounced throughout the length and breadth of the Republic as either insane or a shallow-brained alarmist whose irresponsible and absurd utterances were unworthy of serious consideration.

President McKinley never uttered a truer statement than when he affirmed that forcible annexation would be criminal aggression and contrary to the ethics of free government. Yet we are engaged in precisely that work which the late President described as "criminal aggression." We are giving the lie to the high claims and pretensions that marked the Republic for over a century, and that made her the greatest moral world power—the true leader of the nations.

What more startling or ominous illustration of the rapidity with which the present Government is drifting away from republicanism than the news that the great Declaration of Independence—which for more than a hundred years was not only the most cherished document in America, but the one that we have loved to scatter abroad and that was at once a beacon and an inspiration to Bolivar, San Martin, and all the other great revolutionary and republican heroes of the nineteenth century—is now being suppressed as a treasonable document, under the very folds of the star-spangled banner and by officers of the very nation that was born with its proclamation? Is it possible that the conscience of the people has been so anesthetized by greed for gold that this amazing fact will fail to awaken them to the deadly peril that threatens the cause of free government and human rights?

* * *

THE CULTIVATION OF RICE, TEA, AND SMYRNA FIGS IN THE UNITED STATES.

I. SMYRNA FIGS.

The annual report of the Department of Agriculture suggests anew the unusually valuable work being faithfully carried forward by this great and beneficent bureau of the Government. The report also contains many facts of deep interest to our people. In a previous issue of *THE ARENA* I called attention to the final success that crowned the effort to raise the Smyrna fig in this country—a success due to the patient and intelligent work of the Department and of the fruit-growers of California. Year before last the result of this victory was seen in the eleven tons of Smyrna figs that were raised and dried in California. The "tests made by chemists and fruit experts," says the Secretary of Agriculture, "show these

figs to be superior to the imported product." During the last year between fifty and seventy-five tons were gathered, and the new industry is now so well inaugurated that in a very short time the immense fig trade of the Republic will be supplied by the home market.

II. RICE.

A little over three years ago the Department of Agriculture introduced and distributed a large quantity of Japanese rice, and, though previous to this time rice had been grown in the South, the wonderful impetus that was given to this industry dates from this wise action of the National Government. Millions of dollars were immediately invested in rice culture, and in 1900 about 8,000,000 pounds more rice were produced in this country than in the preceding year; while in 1901 65,000,000 pounds more were raised than in 1900. The effect of home culture is already very marked on the volume of rice imported, as will be seen from the fact that three years ago we purchased about 154,000,000 pounds, and last year our importation was but 73,000,000 pounds. "Evidently," observes Secretary Wilson, "it will be but a few years before the United States will not only grow all the rice consumed here, but will export part of the product as well."

III. TEA.

Another very interesting fact brought out in the report of the Secretary of Agriculture relates to tea in the United States. It has been claimed that the cost of production would render profitable cultivation impossible, but Secretary Wilson asserts that the net profits on this crop average from thirty to forty dollars an acre. Thus a ten-acre garden under proper management would net between three and four hundred dollars a year; while a fifty-acre garden would annually yield, at the minimum figure, fifteen hundred dollars. The Secretary makes the further important announcement that experts who have examined the teas raised in the United States during the last year declare them equal in flavor and aroma to the best imported teas.

Last year Dr. Charles U. Shepard, of Summerville, South Carolina, who has the principal tea-garden in America, "produced about 4,500 pounds of high-grade tea," which was

readily marketed in the North. The Department of Agriculture, with the assistance of Dr. Shepard, is now training a few young men in the technique of the work, and it is reasonable to expect that tea culture will soon be extensively carried on in the South; for, as the Secretary observes, "there are thousands of acres of land and thousands of idle hands that might be made available for this work, and our possibilities in this field should not be neglected."

Under a wise and enlightened statesmanship a liberal appropriation, together with authority to employ out-of-works in the development of these new industries, would result in increasing the national wealth far more rapidly than ship subsidies granted to overrich groups of capitalists, or wars of subjugation; while in a short time the national farms and gardens would return to the national treasury the greater part of the original appropriation. This is a problem worthy of constructive statesmanship.

* * *

A NEW CURE FOR TUBERCULOSIS, OR CONSUMPTION OF THE LUNGS.

Tuberculosis, or consumption of the lungs, is everywhere recognized as one of the most deadly diseases that assail human life; and during recent years many of the most profound and painstaking minds of the medical and scientific worlds have devoted their best energies to a search for some treatment that would prove other than palliative. Much interest was evinced by our readers in an editorial notice in the February ARENA, in which we called attention to the important announcements of two very eminent physicians and scientists of France—Doctors Richet and Hericourt—the latter claiming to have successfully treated thirty-five cases of well-developed tuberculosis with zomol, or raw beef; while both the scientists claim that experiments in feeding inoculated dogs on a raw meat diet seemed to prove conclusively that this diet exhibited a distinct specific action against tuberculosis.

Now we have another remedy for which specific action is claimed from a no less eminent source, which seems to have yielded even more remarkable results, in that cures have resulted when the patients were in the last stages of consumption.

Dr. Robert Maguire, physician to the Brompton Hospital, London, is recognized as one of the leading scientists in the field of physiological and bacteriological research, as well as a foremost authority on tuberculosis. This eminent scientist now claims to have discovered in formaldehyde a specific against the tuberculosis germ. He had long observed that certain antiseptic remedies exhibited excellent results, but their internal administration usually irritated and upset the stomach. He at length conceived the idea that, if he could inject into the blood an antiseptic whose action should prove destructive to the bacillus of tuberculosis, he might save the patient. He settled on formaldehyde as promising the best results, it having been proved that a solution of one hundred and seventy thousandth part was fatal to the tuberculosis germ. He began injections with this mild solution, and gradually increased the strength. The result is said to have been most surprising, the disease not only being quickly arrested, but the affected cavities have soon taken on healthy action. It is affirmed that thorough cures have been effected in cases regarded as absolutely hopeless.

In one case cited by the correspondent of the *New York World*, who reports these results, the patient at the time when the experiments were begun was in the last stages of consumption and beyond all hope of recovery. In less than three months after the first inoculation he was entirely cured—so much so that he was successfully passed 'by another physician as a first-class insurance risk.

The *World's* correspondent adds: "It is asserted by Dr. Maguire that the injections of the drug are painless, and that the hypodermic needle must be inserted near the elbow."

* * *

NOTABLE DISCOVERIES IN THE FIELD OF ILLUMINATION.

The problem of better illumination is proving fruitful under the research of modern scientists. Perhaps the most notable recent discoveries that bid fair to affect the general question of popular illumination are found in acetylene gas and in Mr. Peter Cooper Hewitt's new mercurial electric lamp.

Acetylene gas promises to become very popular for home-lighting. It can be manufactured at a small cost and produces

a white flame of great brilliancy and in character much the same as sunshine. It does not heat or poison the air as much as other gas.

Unless it passes under the control of the Standard Oil Company it will doubtless largely displace kerosene as an illuminator, owing to its cheapness and the superior light it affords.

Mr. Hewitt's lamp has attracted general attention, and the experiments made indicate that the young inventor has contributed in an important way to the solution of the problem of cheaper electric lights. His lamp consists of a glass bulb and tube, into which a gas made of mercury is introduced. The carbon filament of the ordinary lamp is dispensed with, as the gas acts as a conductor for the electric current, lighting up the entire bulb. The points of excellence claimed for this lamp are: its brilliancy, its cheapness, the fact that it can be produced at one-eighth the cost of the incandescent lamp and at one-third the cost of the arc lamp or gas, and the fact that the electric light obtained from the mercurial gas is wholly wanting in red rays. This last peculiarity is of course a drawback for some purposes, but for many uses it has decided advantages. Thus, for reading and various work where the eye is under strain, the new lamp, owing to the absence of red rays, is far less tiring than the ordinary light.

* * *

HOW RUSSIA MET THE ADVANCE OF AN ARROGANT MONOPOLY.

While the American lawmakers and press sleep under the influence of the absinthe of capitalism, and the trusts and monopolies are making a few individuals enormously rich at the expense of millions of our people, other nations, from republican Mexico to autocratic Russia, are waking up to the evil that monopoly works in victimizing the people, plundering government, and debauching the body politic. A short time ago we called attention to the prompt, patriotic, and efficient action of President Diaz, by which a great corn trust or monopoly was broken up in Mexico.

Another suggestive lesson on the trust problem comes from Russia. The government of the White Czar controls the liquor traffic of the realm and annually uses over six billion corks in this department. A trust was formed that attempted to impose

unjust prices—prices probably almost as exorbitant in proportion as our Post-office Department permits the great railway corporations to exact for carrying the people's mail. But the government of the Czar, with all its oppression and its manifold evils, is not beholden to capitalists, trusts, or monopolies, and accordingly met the attempted exactions of the cork trust by establishing a cork manufactory of its own, which has proved eminently satisfactory—so much so that the arrogant capitalistic cork trust is a thing of the past.

* * *

A PATHETIC INCIDENT AND WHAT IT SUGGESTS.

Our daily press persistently asserts that conditions are such in this country at the present time that no able-bodied man who wishes employment need be out of work; yet facts are constantly coming to the surface that utterly disprove this assertion. It is true that to-day, as is always the case during the temporary periods of relative prosperity that follow eras of depression, conditions are far less tragic than they were in the early nineties; but yet in the very hey-day of our vaunted prosperity our land is thronged with able-bodied and willing laborers vainly seeking honest toil—and this is true even where common and laborious work calls for no special training. At the time of the snows the last winter a great army of men promptly appeared in New York City, begging the privilege of clearing away the snow at \$1.25 a day; and the same was true elsewhere. During a recent conflict in Boston between one of the large trucking companies and the labor union, an incident at once pathetic and typical occurred. It was thus reported in the *Boston Post* of January 23:

The dramatic incident of the day occurred near Central wharf. One of the Brine four-horse drays came along Atlantic avenue on the morning trip. It was just in the midst of the excitement and a jam of teams filled the street. Following the team and lined about the street were fully 1,500 people. Near Central wharf the driver got into a serious jam—truck after truck blocked the way, team after team turned in front of him, cut off his horses and he was helpless.

With shouts and yells the mob surrounded him. His police patrol was not sufficient to keep them off. The driver loosened his hold on the reins and waited. Suddenly one venturesome youth leaped on the

truck and with one swoop tore the driver's coat up the back. This was a signal. Stones, mud, and ice began to fly through the air. Ten and fifteen deep around the team, the mob hissed and swore at the driver, calling him every name that could arise to the tongue:

"Scab, scab."

"Why don't you be a man?"

"Ain't the union good enough for you?"

"Shame on you."

The driver dropped his reins. He got up from the seat and looked at the sea of faces around him.

"Why don't I join the union?" he yelled.

"Yes, you miserable scab."

"I'll tell you why not," his voice rang out fiercely. "I'll tell you why not. By God, this is the first job I've had for four months."

Howls of derision broke from the mob.

"I've got to work, d—— you.

"I've got a wife in the hospital. She's dying. I've got two babies at home. How am I going to feed them? Good God, do you want them to starve? I've tramped Boston over for a job, and now I've got it, and by God I'm going to keep it."

As he spoke the tears formed a stain down the side of his cheeks.

Smash—a slushball flattened against his cheek and trickled down his face. That was the crowd's answer to his appeal.

Some one unhitched the traces.

Then the police, reenforced, made a wild rush on the mob and beat them back. Silently the driver climbed down, fastened the traces, and with policemen in front and rear he made his way to the wharf.

Our present anarchic economic and social order puts our vaunted civilization to shame. Here, after two thousand years of Christianity, is a great and powerful nation, producing wealth enough to place every willing worker in ease and comfort if even approximately just conditions prevailed; yet, during periods when the high-water mark of prosperity is being touched and a few individuals are acquiring untold millions annually, we find armies of able-bodied men and women fighting for the opportunity to earn a bare livelihood.

Under enlightened coöperation no such libel on civilization and Christianity would be possible as is found to-day. Under the coöperative standard of "All for all," the essentially savage and brutal spectacle described above would be impossible. Is it not the solemn and sacred duty of every man and woman to labor and to sacrifice in order that the coöperative movements of the hour may be hastened forward? Can any man who remains indifferent to this great demand be considered guiltless in the great To-morrow when life's deeds and oppor-

tunities will weigh for or against the soul in the scales of destiny?

This is a question that cannot be evaded. It confronts you and me to-day as a supreme opportunity to aid in a cause that will exalt and ennable life, elevate civilization, and increase the happiness of mankind for ages to come. In a few years at longest it will again confront our souls, no longer as an opportunity, but as the messenger of gladness or of gloom, in precise proportion as we have accepted or neglected the new and high demands that have come to us.

BOOKS OF THE DAY.

REVIEWED BY B. O. FLOWER.*

THE TRUST IN FICTION: A REMARKABLE SOCIAL NOVEL.

THE OCTOPUS. By Frank Norris. Cloth, 652 pp. Price, \$1.50.
New York: Doubleday, Page & Co., publishers.

A Book Study.

I.

In "The Octopus," Mr. Norris has produced a novel of American life exhibiting the strength, power, vividness, fidelity to truth, photographic accuracy in description, and marvelous insight in depicting human nature, together with that broad and philosophic grasp of the larger problems of life, that noble passion for justice, that characterizes the greatest work of Emile Zola, without that sexualism or repulsive naturalism which the French writer so frequently forces upon his readers, and which is so revolting to the refined and healthy imagination.

"The Octopus" is a work so distinctly great that it justly entitles the author to rank among the very first American novelists. All the characters are real, living men and women, in whose veins runs the red blood of Nature. With one exception, each individual thinks, speaks, acts, and lives in harmony with the nature attributed to him. A noble consistency pervades the volume. Even individual inconsistencies are such as we all find in our own lives. The exception referred to is found in the pitiful sophistry accredited to the great railway magnate, Shelgrim, in which he seeks to shift from his head and the heads of the responsible directors, to the insensate railroad, the blame for the frightful and widespread ruin—the wanton slaughter of brave, loving, and industrious fathers, brothers, and husbands, the destruction of once happy homes, the driving of men to crime and of women and girls to starvation and ruin—that was the direct result of calculating and pre-meditated deception and gross injustice, rendered possible only by bribery and wholesale corruption. When Shelgrim refers to the despoiling of the farmers of their homes, and to the death and ruin that had marked the recent tragedy, as due to the insensate railroad or to blind forces, and not to corrupt individuals, when he compares the railroad with the growing wheat, which unconsciously supplies the world with life-giving bread but is without responsibility for its beneficence,

* Books intended for review in THE ARENA should be addressed to
B. O. Flower, 5 Park Square, Boston, Mass.

he not only insults the intelligence of the poet, but belittles himself in a way quite inconceivable by the utterance of such palpable sophistry. Nor is it imaginable that Presley, even though sick, distraught, and on the verge of nervous collapse, would for a moment have been impressed by such shallow twaddle and false similes. No; Shelgrim was no man to father such pitiful and absurdly fallacious reasoning before a free and intelligent man, though he doubtless did inspire precisely such utterances from the editors of his hireling press and the advocates paid by the railroad to retail such inane talk to voters too sodden and brutalized by long hours and hard toil to be able to see clearly or reason logically.

With this single exception the *dramatis personæ* of the volume think, speak, act, and live in exactly the way you and I, given similar characters, temperaments, and environment, would have thought and acted.

But "The Octopus" is far more than a strong, compelling, and virile story of American life: it is one of the most powerful and faithful social studies to be found in contemporaneous literature. It is a work that will not only stimulate thought: it will quicken the conscience and awaken the moral sensibilities of the reader, exerting much the same influence over the mind as that exerted by Patrick Henry in the House of Burgesses of Virginia, and by those noble utterances of James Otis, Samuel Adams, and John Hancock just prior to our great Revolutionary struggle.

"The Octopus" is founded on a piece of actual history, stern, tragic, and ominous—the "Mussel Slough Affair"—in which the farmers of the San Joaquin Valley were dispossessed by the railroad company, and in their attempt to protect their roof-trees several persons were cruelly murdered. Though, perhaps, in some respects the author cannot be said to have painted the action of the railroad company as darkly as the cold facts of history would warrant, he has on the whole shadowed forth the central facts in a striking manner; while his marvelous descriptive power enables him to bring the case before the reader in so vivid a way that the scenes will long linger—gloomy and disquieting pictures—in memory's halls.

The dark deeds connected with Mussel Slough are typical of many tragic passages that have marked the rise, onward march, and domination of corporate greed—as, indeed, the story is thoroughly typical of the mighty struggle between the people and the trusts.

The tragedy of Spring Valley, Illinois, so vividly related by Mr. Henry Demarest Lloyd in his "A Strike of Millionaires against Miners," and the dark and criminal history of the Standard Oil Company, as described by Mr. Lloyd in his "Wealth *vs.* Commonwealth," are other typical illustrations that will suggest themselves to thoughtful readers as expressing the same savage, brutal, unjust, lawless, and demoralizing spirit that has marked the aggressive march of corporations, monopolies, and trusts.

It remained for Mr. Norris, however, to present in a bold, striking, and powerful romance a concrete illustration, true in spirit, method.

and detail, of the conflict that has been waged between the trusts and the people.

II.

The novel opens in the great San Joaquin Valley, one of the world's mighty wheat-fields, where ranches are like principalities, where not a single blade is seen turning the soil, but battalions of plows moving forward with military precision, simultaneously turning hundreds of furrows. Here it is that the standing wheat is cut, threshed, and sacked by a single great machine. Here it is that farming is carried forward on as colossal a scale as is to be found on the face of the globe.

And into this valley, lured by seductive railroad pamphlets, many men of wealth have come to call from the brown earth her golden harvest, even as some of them had previously called forth gold and silver from the fastnesses of the Sierras.

The circulars of the railroad company had been framed, as later events proved, cruelly to deceive the settlers. They read:

"The Company invites settlers to go upon its lands before patents are issued or the road is completed, and intends in such cases to sell to them in preference to any other applicants and at a price based upon the value of the land without improvements. In ascertaining the value of the lands, any improvements that a settler or any other person may have made on the lands will not be taken into consideration; neither will the price be increased in consequence thereof. . . . Settlers are thus insured that in addition to being accorded the first privilege of purchase, at the graded price, they will also be protected in their improvements. . . . The lands are not uniform in price, but are offered at various figures from \$2.50 upward per acre. Usually land covered with tall timber is held at \$5.00 per acre, and that with pine at \$10.00. Most is for sale at \$2.50 and \$5.00."

The fact that the land mentioned as being above \$2.50 an acre was the timbered land, which was usually held to be worth \$5 an acre, while that covered by valuable pine trees was \$10 an acre, appeared fair and reasonable. Such land was valuable from the very start, while the wide sterile plains of the valley were worthless until improved, cultivated, and in many cases irrigated; and the pledge that improvements should not be considered when the price of land was given seemed to deceive the honest farmers. The railroad had not yet received the title to the land. When it did the settlers should have the opportunity to buy on the favorable terms.

With this promise Magnus Derrick, the most commanding figure among the ranchers, popularly known as "the Governor" throughout the valley, and his favorite son, Harran, had taken up a vast tract containing tens of thousands of acres and known as the Los Muertos Rancho. Annixter, a college graduate who had come into a fortune, had secured the Quien Sabe Rancho, while Osterman, another young man of means, had secured another immensely fertile property. Old man Broderson and other farmers had come into the valley, bringing their all, staking everything on these new homes. Buildings rapidly rose, as extensive as the means of the ranchers would enable them to

erect. Drains and irrigating ditches were made that cost fortunes to dig; and the desert was transformed as by magic into fields of gold that later fed the world.

From the first the railroad had proved to be an "organized appetite." It had carried out the policy of charging in freight tariff "all the traffic would bear." A State Commission had been elected, which it had been believed would be loyal to the people; but here, as everywhere else, were the evidences of the corrupting touch of the railroad corporation. The Commission had made a rate so absurdly low that no road could carry the freight except at a loss. The road refused to abide by the schedule, claiming that it amounted to confiscation. The courts upheld the railroad and ruled that, as they had no power to make rates, the only thing to be done was to put the rates back to the old exorbitant figure.

In the opening chapters we find the leading ranchmen assembled at the home of Magnus Derrick in consultation. Many things had recently occurred to exasperate the farmers. That very day Magnus and Harran Derrick had discovered their car-load of new plows, ordered months before, side-tracked at Bonneville. They had just arrived in time for work, as the autumn rains had set in; but while making the arrangements to have them taken to Los Muertos, S. Behrman, the representative of the railroad, appeared, reminding the farmer that it was a rule of the railroad that all freight had to go to the terminal point and then be shipped back to its destination. This rule was to give the railroad the advantage of the exorbitant short-haul rates; and therefore, though the plows were badly needed, though they were side-tracked at their destination, they could not be touched until they were taken to San Francisco and re-shipped back to Bonneville. And this incident was only one of a number of occurrences in which the greed and unjust aggressions of the railroad were exasperating the farmers. The action of the Commission and the judgment in regard to rates of the wheat tariff satisfied the ranchers that the company's corrupting influence was being exerted in every department of the State government; and some one suggested that they fight the devil with fire—that, as they had exhausted every honorable and legitimate means of warfare, they should now meet the railroad on its own field and secure a commission of their own through bribery.

Magnus Derrick repels with indignation this proposition, but the others urge that no other hope remains to the farmers but to secure the nomination of two commissioners who can be relied upon as being loyal to their interests. A certain Mr. Darrell, in the southern part of the State, they believe to be such a man, and for the other they settle upon Magnus Derrick's elder son, Lyman, now a rising lawyer in San Francisco. Young Derrick, unfortunately for the Farmers' League, has political ambitions. He aspires to be Governor, and two years before received assurances of favor from the great railroad company, provided he would be loyal to them. This, of course, was not known to the

League. Finally the election came off, and the ranchers' board was triumphantly elected.

In the meantime rumors are circulated that the road is at last ready to grade the land. The farmers have been impatient to get the title to their land, and at first hail the news with satisfaction. They have taken the land, which would have been a drug at \$2.50 an acre, but, by draining, irrigating, planting with trees, and improving by the erection of fine buildings, they have raised its value to fully \$15 an acre. Soon the rumors of the regrading of the land are coupled with the intimation that the railroad company, in violation of its pledge, proposes to charge the settlers a price quite equal to the worth of the land with all its improvements.

The dramatic first act of the story closes with a ball at the new barn of Annixer, where all the country is well-nigh present. It is a highly sensational and thrilling time, culminating with telegrams being handed to the ranchers by which they are informed that the company demands from \$20 to \$27 an acre for their holdings—a price that will mean worse than ruin to them.

From this time on the movement is swift and the action frequently highly dramatic. The raising of Annixer from the plane of self-absorption and low ideals to that of exalted manhood, under the reforming influence of a noble woman's love; the ruin of Dyke through the road's advancing the rate on hops, and the tragic aftermath; the work of the new railroad commission; the visit of Lyman and the tremendously dramatic scene in the home of Magnus Derrick, in which the betrayer of the people is denounced and disowned by Magnus—all are vividly described. Then comes the great rabbit chase and picnic gotten up by Osterman, followed immediately by the supreme tragedy, when the officers, at the instigation of the railroad, begin evicting the farmers from their homes, while the latter resist to the bloody end.

Then the scene is shifted to San Francisco, and we catch a glimpse of Shelgrim and are present at a banquet given by one of the millionaire directors of the railroad, where the costliest of imported wines and viands of the rarest are served; while without poor old Mrs. Hooven, widowed by the railroad, and her little daughter, starving and sick, are begging for a crust of bread.

After a last glance over the San Joaquin Valley we find ourselves on the steamer that is loading with wheat for famine-stricken India; and here we come face to face with one of the strongest situations in modern fiction. The highly dramatic death of S. Behrman, weird, uncanny, and terrible, is as great a piece of work as Victor Hugo's vivid description of Gilliatt's struggle with the octopus, in his "Toilers of the Sea." S. Behrman, the smooth-tongued, remorseless, relentless man, who is at once the type of the soulless and cruel railroad corporation and its efficient tool, rising to opulence through the wheat that he has plundered from honest industry, is at last swallowed up, crushed, suffocated, destroyed by that same wheat.

III.

"The Octopus" is a work of genius. Not only is it a powerful romance of compelling interest—thrilling, dramatic, and so graphic that its various shifting scenes stand out clear-cut and unforgettable, but as a social study it possesses a historical value equaled by few works of fiction. It is, broadly speaking, typically historical not only of the great railroad corporation, whose story is so well known on the Pacific Coast, but of the railroad corporations of the United States, and of the trusts in general.

It is part of the settled policy of the complacent tools and servants of corporate power to seek to discredit all such pictures, even though they know full well that for more than a quarter of a century the baleful influence of corporate greed has been felt throughout the length and breadth of the land, not only in the levying of unjust tributes on the poor but in the debauching and corruption of government in all its ramifications. "The Octopus" shows in a vivid manner how this supreme tragedy—this lowering of the political ideals from the fundamental demands of justice, honesty, and freedom to subserviency to capitalistic aggression—has been accomplished in the United States. It is very easy for apologists and beneficiaries of corporate corruption to seek to discredit such pictures as "fiction." The facts on which this novel is based, however, were a terrible reality; and the methods by which the great railroad power became well-nigh omnipotent on the Pacific Coast have been indicated by the publication of letters of C. P. Huntington to General Colton. These communications, it will be remembered, were made public in the famous suit brought in Santa Rosa, California, to decide whether the widow of General Colton had been fairly dealt with by the railroad company, in whose confidential service the General had long been engaged. In these letters we have a startling revelation of how the railroad magnates tampered with officials, how they made and unmade committees, how they worked in Congress through the press, how neither Governors, Congressmen, statesmen, members of the Cabinet and judges, the Associated Press, nor the editors of the country escaped the argus eyes of the railroad officials.

The bribery by the wholesale issuance of railroad passes and the enormous sums of money needed to "fix things" or "convince" legislators—these and other things are more or less baldly set forth in these memorable letters, in which Thomas Scott and C. P. Huntington figure as warring chiefs.

And when we turn from the Pacific slope the same facts meet the eye everywhere. The amazing admissions of Jay Gould before the investigating committee of the New York Legislature in 1873 startled the nation for a brief period, and the report of this committee was a sickening revelation of gigantic corruption. The exorbitant prices paid by our own all too complacent Post Office Department for the rental of cars and the hauling of mails have been for years a national scandal. It was this shameful plundering of the people for the railroads, permitted by the Post Office Department, that called for the following

impressive words in the halls of the United States Senate from one of the Eastern Senators:

"The fact is, Mr. President, that the great power of these corporations who control everything, who are powerful enough to make and unmake public men, is so omnipotent that no executive officer has been found in the last twelve years, except in the single case of Postmaster-General Vilas, who has attempted to reduce the compensation for mail transportation; and within six months after he had left the Department every economy that he introduced had been wiped away, and the companies received not only what they had received before but their compensation was increased. Never, during my long service in this body, except in this one instance, have I known of a Postmaster-General making a *bona fide* effort to control this railroad extortion, which every one knows to exist."

The recent exhibition of the subserviency of the machinery of justice in New York City to the New York Central Railroad is another striking illustration of the facts that Mr. Norris so eloquently emphasizes in his novel.

But it must not be imagined that "*The Octopus*" is primarily a social study. It is above all a great literary creation. The author is at all times the artist. Only on rare occasions, like the following for example, do the characters moralize. Here, however, we have the great California manufacturer, Cedarquist, thus referring to the supreme peril of the Republic:

"If I were to name the one crying evil of American life, . . . it would be the indifference of the better people to public affairs. It is so in all our great centers. There are other great trusts, God knows, in the United States, besides our own dear P. and S. W. Railroad. Every State has its own grievance. If it is not a railroad trust, it is a sugar trust, or an oil trust, or an industrial trust, that exploits the People, *because the People allow it*. The indifference of the People is the opportunity of the despot. It is as true as that the whole is greater than a part, and the maxim is so old that it is trite—it is laughable. It is neglected and disused for the sake of some new ingenious and complicated theory, some wonderful scheme of reorganization, but the fact remains, nevertheless, simple, fundamental, everlasting. The People have but to say 'No,' and not the strongest tyranny, political, religious, or financial, that was ever organized could survive one week."

Mr. Norris unfolds a mighty drama, which concerns our own time. He paints colossal pictures so vividly that there is small need for didactic moralizing about them. One feels from the first that he is in the presence of a great artist, a man of real genius; and though there is more of shadow than of sunshine in the highly dramatic romance there are many passages of great beauty. The descriptions of Nature and her marvelous works, the portraying of Vanamee, and the wonderful transformation of Annixer are typical examples of the beauty and poetry that abound in this volume.

"*The Octopus*" is a novel that every reader of *THE ARENA* should possess. If it is impossible for you to procure more than one work of fiction this season, my advice—my unhesitating advice—is to buy "*The*

"Octopus," read it aloud to your family, and then lend it to your neighbors. In so doing you will be helping to awaken the people from the death-dealing slumber that has been brought about by the multitudinous influences of corporate greed, controlling the machinery of government and the opinion-forming agencies of the Republic.

THE NEW WORLD AND THE NEW THOUGHT. By James T. Bixby, Ph.D. Cloth, 218 pp. Price, \$1 net. New York: Thomas Whittaker.

Among the ripe scholars who have come under the broadening influence of modern critical thought, yet who have not been carried to the extremes that mark the agnostics, Professor Bixby holds a high place. In many ways he is carrying forward the important work to which the late James Freeman Clark devoted his life. His utterances are at all times temperate, reverent, and thoughtful. He appreciates the value and the verity of man's religious nature. He is a child alike of faith and of reason; hence, the falling away of the false in theology, which so frightens the timid, reveals to him in clearer outline the great eternal verities of religion.

In the present volume we have nine chapters, in which the author discusses "The Expansion of the Universe and the Enlargement of Faith," "The Sanction for Morality in Nature," "The Agnostic's Difficulties and the Knowability of Divine Realities," "The Scientific Validity of our Religious Instincts," "Evolution and Christianity," "The Old Testament as Literature," "Christian Discipleship and Modern Life," "Modern Dogmatism and the Unbelief of the Age," and "Union of the Churches in One Spiritual Household."

Perhaps the most interesting and timely discussion is the one in which Dr. Bixby eloquently pleads for a "union of the churches in one spiritual household." In this chapter he deals with a growing sentiment throughout Christendom that is one of the most hopeful signs of our times. The spirit and sentiment of the author are well embodied in the following closing words, which we are persuaded will echo the earnest desire of millions of deeply religious people of various creeds and faiths:

"Whatever dogmatism or sectarian ambition divides and impoverishes the forces that are battling to maintain righteousness and uplift humanity is a form of anti-Christ. Whatever can bring these forces into closer union and a firmer front; whatever can make the people learn to think of the Church as one body in many members—be it pulpit exchanges between the clergy of different denominations; city ministerial associations, or State conferences of religion, embracing all denominations; union meetings for prayer or thanksgiving; common communion services open to the members of all denominations of Christians, without invidious distinctions—any signal of a broader goodwill between the churches, erasing sectarian divisions, however trivial

it may be, is helping forward the prayer of the Master that 'they all may be one.'

"Of one blood, says Paul, are we all made. With God, the common Father, there is no respect of persons. One and the same haven of peace and love we all seek. Back of every varied soul and symbol stands the one Holy Spirit, by whose inspiration the holy men that founded each diverse church spake as they were moved in their respective age and land. No path of prayer but has lifted men nearer God; no creed has man framed but was as the broken lisplings of an infant beside the unutterable perfection of the Divine."

The work throughout is intensely interesting, being the ripe fruition of the thought of one who is at once a deep scholar, a logical reasoner, a man of faith, and a master in the art of composition.

IMPERIALISM AND LIBERTY. By Morrison L. Swift. Cloth, 492 pp. Price, \$1.50. Los Angeles, Cal.: The Ronbroke Press.

This is a strong, clear, earnest protest against the present imperialistic craze that is carrying our Government over from the position of Liberty's leader to one of the brood of warring imperialistic monarchical nations engaged in what President McKinley, in one of his better and nobler moments, happily termed "criminal aggression."

Mr. Swift makes a strong case for the republican ideal. His work is vigorous and impassioned, but it is also logical and convincing. The evils he herein predicts are being rapidly realized. The author is a true patriot—a patriot of the stamp of John Hancock, Samuel Adams, Washington, Jefferson, and Franklin. "*Imperialism and Liberty*" should be widely circulated.

THE DOOM OF DOGMA AND THE DAWN OF TRUTH. By Henry Frank. Cloth, 394 pp. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

In this able work Mr. Henry Frank has given us a bold and a radical treatise, which is at once broad and scholarly, and, what is still more rare in such works, reverent and constructive in spirit and character. It is a work that has been needed. Not that the field is new, for there are many scholarly treatises that have emphasized different phases of the subject matter here considered, but they have for the most part been prepared for scholars rather than for the general reader; while most assailants of dogma who have written for the popular taste have been extreme in language and destructive in spirit. Mr. Frank has given us a work for thoughtful men and women who find little comfort in the old theology, with its scheme of redemption as outlined in the blood atonement and an endless hell for the majority.

In eighteen chapters our author discusses subjects such as the following: "*The Curse and Reconciliation, or Atonement Reinterpreted;*" "*The God Within, or 'Inspiration' Redefined;*" "*The Revolt of Reason,*

or the Rehabilitation of Belief;" "Natural Phenomena in Christian Theology, or the Trinity of Man Reflected in the Trinity of God;" "The Myth of Hell, or the Human Heart Explored;" "God Made Flesh, or the Myth of Human Deification;" "The Making and Unmaking of the Creed;" "The Age of Calvin;" "The Christening of the Creed;" "The Defamation of Deity, or the Scandal of Theology;" "The Crumbling Creed of Christendom," and "The Fundamental Conflict Between Religion and Theology."

All these themes are treated in a masterly manner, evincing wide reading and deep research. The volume is an extremely valuable contribution to liberal literature.

GOOD CHEER NUGGETS. Compiled by Jeanne G. Pennington.

Cloth, 112 pp. Price, 45 cents. New York: Fords, Howard & Hulbert.

This little work contains a number of choice and helpful brief selections from the writings of Maeterlinck, Le Conte, Hugo, and Dresser. The larger part of the work is given to Mr. Dresser, and the selections from his writings are excellent. We do not think the compiler has been so happy in her selections from the three great thinkers who occupy the first sixty pages of the book. Especially is this true of the selections from Hugo, considering the rich mines before Miss Pennington. The great Frenchman's work on William Shakespeare, which is so full of bright, inspiring, and noble utterances, seems to have been entirely overlooked by the compiler.

BEYOND THE BLACK OCEAN. A Story of Social Revolution. By

the Rev. Father T. McGrady. Cloth, 304 pp. Price, \$1. Terre Haute, Ind.: The Standard Publishing Company.

This is a new social romance, written by the brilliant young Socialist priest, Father Thomas McGrady. It is an earnest work that is calculated to appeal with especial force to Irishmen. The author has written primarily for the laboring men; and, using his romance as a vehicle for an exposition of the Single Tax and Socialistic theories of government, he has contributed another valuable note to the rapidly increasing chorus of social progress.

Father McGrady is a brilliant orator and a natural debater. He is not so happy as a novelist as he is when he comes to present the gospel of justice and equity as proclaimed by Socialism; but those chapters in which he pleads for the Fraternal State, in which he explains and argues in favor of the right of all the people to enjoy the earth, and the duty of society to secure justice, freedom, and independence for all men, are excellent and will do much for the cause of righteousness and justice.

DOROTHY QUINCY, WIFE OF JOHN HANCOCK. With Events of His Time. By Ellen C. D. Q. Woodbury, her great-grand-niece. Illustrated, cloth, 260 pp. Price, \$1.50. Washington, D. C.: The Neale Pub. Co.

At the present time, when the splendid principles of free government that made the United States for over a century the leader in the vanguard of civilization are being trodden under foot by the fatal demands of a materialistic and soulless commercialism, and when the great Declaration of Independence and the brave and immortal words of the founders of our government cannot be proclaimed in all places where the flag of the Republic floats as the symbol of national authority, it is most important and fitting that the widest possible circulation be given to the lives and words of the great men and women who risked everything most dear to them for the eternal principles of self-government and freedom as voiced by the Declaration.

This volume is more than a biographic sketch of the beautiful, brilliant, and intellectual Dorothy Quincy. It deals in a large way with the life of John Hancock, and in so doing introduces the reader into the very council chamber of the Revolution, where the brave and noble sentiments of liberty, justice, and fraternity were being crystallized into a creed for the infant nation. It is a book that, while well calculated to inspire noble and true patriotism, is ill suited to foster the spirit of imperialism that has blinded our Republic to her high charge and holy trust, and has made us a robber nation, engaged in crushing the aspirations of a people for the same freedom that our fathers died to earn for us. The work is well written and highly interesting. It is a valuable addition to our biographic literature.

MINETTE: A STORY OF THE FIRST CRUSADE. By George F. Cram. Illustrated, cloth, 398 pp. Price, \$1.50. Chicago: John W. Iliff & Co.

This work belongs to the numerous brood of historical romances that fill the land like the locusts of ancient Egypt. It is far inferior to Mr. Hewlett's "Richard Yea-and-Nay," which deals with the Crusade of a later period, and it is not to be compared with the novels of the elder Dumas or his popular imitator, Mr. Stanley Weyman; yet it is far superior to the majority of so-called historical novels of the day. The atmosphere is as wholesome as that of a story dealing with war and rapine, with fighting under the banner of the Prince of Peace and of Mahomet, could be; and, indeed, in this respect it is a better book than most of the swashbuckling romances. It deals with the great and pure love of two innocent girls of strong character and noble birth; with the intrigues and crimes of a revengeful and rejected lover, who leagues himself with the Mahometans while pretending to battle for the Cross; and with the exploits of the hero and his friends, who, like

all other such heroes, achieves marvelous feats and exhibits a tenacity of life that would put the proverbial cat to shame. Yet in the end the great Reaper garners in a full harvest. There are many strong passages, and the work abounds in highly dramatic situations, though the dialogue is often too long drawn out. It is a book that will hold the interest of the general reader who has acquired a taste for such romances, especially if he is interested in the Crusades.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

"Astrology and Socialism; or, The New Era. A Review and a Forecast." By Frank T. Allen. Paper, 24 pp. Price, 25 cents. New York: The Alliance Pub. Co.

"Seralmo." By Archie Bell. Cloth, 91 pp. New York: F. Tennyson Neely.

"Tales from Town Topics." Paper, 248 pp. Price, 50 cents. New York: Town Topics Pub. Co.

"Book of Secrets." By Horatio Dresser. Cloth, 138 pp. Price, \$1 net. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

"Father Manners." By Hudson Young. Cloth, 206 pp. Price, \$1 net. New York: The Abbey Press.

"Delsarte System of Expression." By Genevieve Stebbins. Illustrated. Cloth, 507 pp. Price, \$2. New York: Edgar S. Werner Pub. and Supply Co.

"The American Farmer." By A. M. Simons. Cloth, 208 pp. Price, 50 cents. Chicago: Chas. H. Kerr & Co.

"Graded Physical Exercises." By Bertha L. Colburn. Cloth, 389 pp. Price, \$1. New York: Edgar S. Werner Pub. and Supply Co.

"Shakespeare's Macbeth and the Ruin of Souls." By William Miller, D.D. Cloth, 126 pp. Price, 2 shillings. Madras, India: G. A. Natesan, Esplanade Row.

"Visions of Life." Poems. By Martha Shepard Lippincott. Cloth, 398 pp. Price, \$1.25. New York: The Abbey Press.

"Sanity of Mind." By David F. Lincoln, M.D. Cloth, 178 pp. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

"What Say the Scriptures About Hell?" Paper, 88 pp. Price, 10 cents. Allegheny, Pa.: Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society.

"Our Accursed Spelling." Edited by E. O. Vaile. Paper, 142 pp. Oak Park, Chicago: E. O. Vaile.

"Eastern Peru and Bolivia." By Wm. C. Agle. Paper, 45 pp. Price, 50 cents. Seattle, Wash.: The Homer M. Hill Pub. Co.

"Ancient and Modern Physics." By T. E. Willson. Paper, 74 pp. Flushing, N. Y.: Charles Johnston.

"A Dream of Realms Beyond Us." By Adair Welcker. Paper, 29 pp. Published by the author.

"The Twentieth Century City." Proceedings of the Annual Convention, 1901, of the American League for Civic Improvement. Paper, 80 pp.

NOTES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS.

THE pathetic apprehension of King Edward VII. that his approaching coronation festivities may be marred by failure to make peace with the Boers, on the part of the Christian Government of which he is the figurehead, imparts a peculiar interest to our leading article this month. Dr. Maxey, the author, is a close observer of racial events and a profound student of world politics. The treaty recently effected between Great Britain and Japan, as he clearly points out, is chiefly significant because it portends the advent of a new factor in international statesmanship—the “balance of power” in the Orient. That this problem will increase in both importance and delicacy with the cessation of hostilities in South Africa is self-evident, and Dr. Maxey’s paper, though brief, sheds much light on its probable effect upon European channels of diplomacy and the agencies of American commerce.

The many occurrences that seem to suggest a widespread lowering of our democratic ideals tend to develop a spirit of pessimism in the minds of most lovers of liberty in this country; yet beneath the passing phases of militarism, monopoly, and the centralization of power and authority in obedience to the “strenuous” ideal there is a deep undercurrent of fidelity to the standards of freedom and equality of rights. This is shown in an essay in this issue on “The Popular Election of U. S. Senators.” Our contributor, Charles H. Fox, is a Doctor of Philosophy (Heidelberg) whose wide knowledge of history, literature, and government is fully equaled by his familiarity with American traditions and his love for republican institutions. His paper glows with reassurances of the vitality of democracy as a political sentiment and heritage, and suggests the expansion of popular liberty and sovereignty rather than their curtailment or effeteness.

Such is the tenacity and the potency of the orthodox and conventional that **THE ARENA** is apparently the only high-class magazine in the world that dares to publish facts or opinions

pertaining to advanced religion; yet opportunities for comparative study along this line should be welcomed by every friend of progress. In this month's symposium we present opposing views upon Buddhism, which is believed to be numerically the world's greatest religion. Our Japanese contributor is a well-known representative of the system, well qualified to speak authoritatively on its philosophy and doctrines; while the Rev. Dr. Rice, who records his actual observations of Buddhistic customs and practises, makes many strong points in favor of the Christian morality and precepts. Although an astute observer from Japan might pick an equal number of flaws, differing in kind, in many lands in which the standard of the Great Nazarene is predominant, yet the supremacy of Jesus among world-teachers must be conceded even by those to whom the acts and utterances of his professed followers are repellent.

Probably the most important contribution on the vital relation between education and democracy that has ever appeared in these pages is the "Conversation," in this number, with Rabbi Charles Fleischer. This gentleman is one of the most liberal and progressive of Hebrew scholars. He is also a profound thinker, a broad-minded teacher, and a typical representative of that capacity for keen analysis and searching criticism that is characteristic of his race. His views on our methods of public instruction and the importance of education in the perpetuity of our democratic institutions should interest every friend of the Republic, and especially those concerned in the moral and intellectual welfare of the young.

A "Conversation" between Editor Patterson and C. W. Penrose, editor of the *Deseret News*, of Salt Lake City, will appear in our next issue. The subject-matter will relate chiefly to the proposed amendment to the Constitution prohibiting polygamy and to the Mormon position on the question of plural marriage. Mr. Penrose's statements will correct many misapprehensions of the popular mind, and will enlist the attention of our law-makers as well as that of social economists everywhere.

Dr. Keyes' excellent article on "The Physical Basis of History," announced for publication this month, is unavoidably held over till June, which number will contain, in addition, an important paper by the Rev. James H. Ecob, D.D., of Philadelphia, on "The Russian Remedy;" "Humanity's Progress," by Marvin Dana, F.R.G.S.; "The Ancient Working People," by William Bailie, and "Are Women to Blame?" by Elliott Flower, which is a most timely contribution to our series on topics of sociologic and domestic interest. Other articles are in preparation that will amply sustain THE ARENA's leadership of the world's progressive publications and furnish information on a variety of subjects of present-day significance.

J. E. M.